



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Arms Control

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release:
Distribution Unlimited

19980515 092

REPRODUCED BY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

Arms Control

JPRS-TAC-90-015

CONTENTS

16 May 1990

CHINA

Limited Real Change Seen in Soviet Military Doctrine [SHIJIE ZHISHI No 2, 16 Jan]	1
SHIJIE ZHISHI Views Soviet Military Spending, Trends [SHIJIE ZHISHI No 8, 16 Apr]	2
U.S. Planned Military Adjustments in Pacific Noted [JIEFANGJUN BAO 23 Apr]	4
Envoy Urges Halt to Arms Race at UN Session [XINHUA 8 May]	5

EAST ASIA

JAPAN

Okinawa Governor Welcomes U.S. Troop Reduction [OKINAWA TIMES 20 Apr]	6
---	---

SOUTH KOREA

Weapons Purchased Under 'Less Favorable Terms' [TONG-A ILBO 24 Apr]	6
---	---

MONGOLIA

Soviet Troop Withdrawal To Begin Mid-May [Ulaanbaatar International 7 May]	7
--	---

PHILIPPINES

Soviet Envoy on U.S. Troop Reduction in Asia [Hong Kong AFP 8 May]	7
--	---

THAILAND

Purchase of PRC Antiship Missiles Approved [THE NATION 30 Apr]	8
--	---

EAST EUROPE

INTERBLOC AFFAIRS

No Agreement on Key 'Open Skies' Issues [MTI 4 May]	9
---	---

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Soviet Soldiers, Tanks Withdraw 4 May [CTK 4 May]	9
Bush Arms Initiative 'New and Positive Step' [P. Susko; Bratislava Radio 4 May]	9

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Eppelmann on NATO Membership, Soviet Troops [R. Eppelmann; Hamburg BILD 2 May]	10
SCUD-B Missiles Transferred to Soviet Union [ADN 3 May]	10
Report on U.S. Air-to-Ground Missiles [ADN 6 May]	10

HUNGARY

Chief of Staff Borsits Comments on Withdrawal [L. Borsits; Budapest Radio 5 May]	10
--	----

POLAND

National Military, Security Position Viewed [J. Kaczmarek; TYGODNIK SOLIDARITY 16 Mar]	11
Siwicki on Reducing Soviet Troops, Security [PAP 30 Apr]	13
Dubinin on Withdrawal of Soviet Troops [Warsaw TV 30 Apr]	14
General Siwicki on Soviet Troop Withdrawals [F. Siwicki; ZOLNIERZ RZECZYPOSPOLITEJ 30 Apr-1 May]	14

LATIN AMERICA

ARGENTINA

Defunct Condor II Missile Project Discussed	16
Menem Denies Foreign Pressure [Madrid EFE 28 Apr]	16
Daily Provides Technical Profile [CLARIN 29 Apr]	16
Air Force, U.S. Firm To Manufacture Combat Jets [NOTICIAS ARGENTINAS 2 May]	17

CUBA

Second Stage of Troop Withdrawal From Angola Ends [Havana TV 3 May]	18
---	----

NEAR EAST & SOUTH ASIA

INDIA

Australian Mirage Jet Sale to Pakistan Opposed	19
'Lethal Potential' Cited [Melbourne International 25 Apr]	19
Australian Envoy Summoned [Delhi Radio 25 Apr]	19

IRAN

United States Accused of Giving Iraq Chemical Weapons [ABRAR 10 Apr]	19
Gulf Air, Naval Maneuvers Planned for May [Tehran Radio 28 Apr]	20

IRAQ

Official Comments on Nuclear Weapons, Israel [INA 2 May]	20
--	----

LIBYA

Further on Chemical Weapons Allegations	20
Sabha Facility Cited [Hamburg DPA 5 May]	20
'Official Source' Denies Report [JANA 6 May]	21

PAKISTAN

New Antitank, Antiaircraft Missile Developed [THE MUSLIM 7 May]	21
---	----

SAUDI ARABIA

'Source' Denies Computer Use for Iraqi Missile [SPA 27 Apr]	21
Defense Minister Cited on Arms Supplies [Bin-'Abd-al-'Aziz; London AL-HAWADITH 27 Apr]	21
Ability to Obtain, Make Nuclear Arms Denied [SPA 28 Apr]	22

SYRIA

Soviet Envoy Holds News Conference on al-Asad USSR Visit	23
Affirms Commitment to Nation's Security [Paris Radio Monte Carlo 1 May]	23
Israel, U.S. Faulted on Peace Efforts [L. Faris; Paris Radio Monte Carlo 1 May]	23
Views Results of Moscow Meeting [SANA 2 May]	23

SOVIET UNION

Lapygin on Arms Talks, U.S. Defense Programs, Naval Superiority [V. Lapygin; ZA RUBEZHOM No 16, 13-19 Apr]	25
---	----

WEST EUROPE

EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

NATO's Woerner Calls for Readjusting Strategy [Hamburg DPA 2 May]	27
---	----

BELGIUM

Weapons Firm Investigated for Links With Iraq [Paris AFP 5 May]	27
Defense Minister Welcomes Bush Arms Proposals [Brussels Radio 4 May]	27

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Stoltenberg Meets With U.S. Officials	27
Stresses Continued Need for NATO [DPA 1 May]	27
Assured on Defense by Cheney [DPA 1 May]	28
Defense Minister Rejects Nuclear-Free Status [DPA 2 May]	28
Kohl Strongly Welcomes Bush Disarmament Plan [DPA 4 May]	28
Shevardnadze on 'Compromise' on NATO Membership [DPA 4 May]	28
BUNTE: Al-Qadhdhafi Builds Poison Gas Plant [Cologne Radio 4 May]	29
Firm Said To Aid New Libyan Chemical Plant [DER SPIEGEL 7 May]	29

FRANCE

Former Officials Urge NATO Reintegration [LE MONDE 18-19 Mar]	29
Rafale Substitution for Mirage-IV Viewed [LE MONDE 21 Mar]	30
'U.S. Departure From Europe' View Analyzed [F. de Rose; LE MONDE 24 Mar]	30
Eurodeputy Urges NATO Restructuring [A. Lamassoure; LIBERATION 24-25 Mar]	31
Composite Materials in 'Tiger' Helicopter [H. Tricot; LE QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS 28 Mar]	32
Aerospatiale, Italian Firm Sign Agreement [AFP 7 May]	33

GREECE

Recriminations on Mirage Aircraft Purchase	33
Reported Uselessness [I KATHIMERINI 18 Mar]	33
Balance of Forces Affected [P. Oikonomou; I KATHIMERINI 1 Apr]	34
U.S. Aircraft to Turkey [K. Iordhanidhis; I KATHIMERINI 1 Apr]	35

PORTUGAL

Interest in Locally Produced Laser Weapon [DIARIO DE NOTICIAS 25 Feb]	36
---	----

TURKEY

Need for Increased Arms Spending Explained [T. Gungor; DUNYA 19 Mar]	36
--	----

UNITED KINGDOM

'Stiffening' of Soviet Arms Stance Seen [C. Moncrieff; PRESS ASSOCIATION 5 May]	37
---	----

Limited Real Change Seen in Soviet Military Doctrine

90WC0046A Beijing SHIJIE ZHISHI in Chinese No 2, 16 Jan 90 pp 24-25

[Article by Zhou Aiqun (0719 1947 5028): "The Soviet Union Adjusts Its Military Strategy"]

[Text] In recent years, at the same time as it has been destroying intermediate-range nuclear missiles in accordance with the U.S.-Soviet Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, the Soviet Union has continually raised disarmament proposals and adopted measures to reduce military expenditures and personnel. Late last year, the Soviet Ministry of National Defense announced a 1990 military budget of 70.9 billion rubles, which was 8.2 percent smaller than that of the previous year. At the same time, as of 1 January this year, Soviet military personnel totaled 3,993,000, a decrease of 265,000. The Soviet Union's reduction of military expenditures and personnel and its public announcement of concrete figures concerning its military expenditures and troop strength touched off a lot of discussion about the Soviet Union's adjustment of its military strategy. People remember the announcement by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in early December 1989 in the UN General Assembly that the Soviet Union would cut its troops by 500,000 within two years and would gradually "switch from an arms economy to a disarmament economy." These kinds of changes by the Soviet Union in the military sphere indicate that it is now setting about the task of readjusting its military strategy in response to the domestic and international situation.

Signs of Readjustment

According to reports and analyses carried in Western and Soviet print media, the current readjustment in military strategy by the Soviet Union is broad in content and touches upon many issues. The most important indicator is its switch from an emphasis on a strategic offensive posture to an emphasis on a strategic defensive posture. This is manifested primarily in the following ways:

1. Switching from comprehensive preparations for real war to a focus on preventing the outbreak of war. During Khrushchev's time, the Soviet Union focused on preparations for a large-scale nuclear war using rockets, and felt that this would be the only type of war possible. "Any war, even if it begins as a conventional war, will change to a nuclear war involving rockets and bringing great destruction." In the Brezhnev era, the Soviet Union advocated fighting all types of wars. At the same time as it prepared for large-scale nuclear war involving rockets, it strengthened its preparation for conventional warfare. It felt that future wars "could be either nuclear or conventional; either global or limited." In the latter Brezhnev era, there was some change in the view of nuclear war and nuclear weapons. At the same time as it carried out comprehensive preparations for real war, it attached more and more importance to conventional

warfare backed up by nuclear weapons, and it brought forth the theory of "strategic theater campaigns." In the Khrushchev and Brezhnev eras, although the Soviet Union's views on what kind of war should be fought were not always the same, it always believed that in any war the Soviet Union should take the offensive. It focused on preparing for and winning any war of any type.

After Gorbachev came to power, the Soviet Union made a clear pronouncement that prevention of war and counterattack against invasion were the two great tasks of its military theory, and top priority was granted to the prevention of war. It felt it could afford to fight neither nuclear nor conventional war. Although these statements by the Soviet Union were needed for propaganda purposes, they also indicated increased caution by the Soviet Union toward the use of military force outside its own borders.

2. Switching from military expansion to an emphasis on building a quality army. For a long time, the Soviet Union continually expanded its military power, and it far exceeds defensive requirements. After Gorbachev came to power, he reversed past precedent by proposing the principle of "reasonable and sufficient" power, and the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in 1988 affirmed the program of building a quality military. In order to carry out this program, the Soviet Union decided to reduce military expenditures. They decided to cut expenditures by 1.5 percent in 1989 and by 14.2 percent in 1990 and 1991 from a base that had already been frozen in 1987 and 1988. The Soviet Union also took measures to reduce numbers of troops and shrink the scope of industrial production by military industries. Many national defense industry departments have switched to production of civilian goods. They have adopted the principle of "more research and development, less production," thereby maintaining an advanced level of technology while decelerating the reequipping of troops. They strengthened the C3I Project, thereby improving command and rapid response capability. They have improved the combat readiness of their troops. It is apparent that the Soviet Union intends to change its military forces, which had been too large, into one appropriate to its economic strength and appropriate for its role as a superpower. It is also apparent that the Soviet Union intends to achieve "low-level parity" with the United States.

3. Switching gradually from strengthening offensive operational capability to strengthening defensive operational capability. The Soviet Union is now proceeding primarily on two fronts. First, they are readjusting tasks and development objectives for the five big arms of the military. The Strategic Rocket Forces, which previously stressed tactics for actual war, are now beginning to stress methods for preventing war. Their size may be further reduced, and the importance of their position would drop correspondingly. The Army is beginning to emphasize development of defensive operational capability on its home soil. Troop strength and offensive weapons may be somewhat reduced, and stress will be

placed on the strengthening of defensive operational capability. The Air Force will reduce some old fighters and bombers. The Navy will reduce deep-sea operations and maneuvers. There will be a relatively large reduction in the number of ships, but development of large surface-operations vessels will continue to receive high priority. The position and role of the Air Defense Forces will rise further, and its relative importance among the five arms of the military will grow. The second way in which the Soviet Union is strengthening its defensive operational capability is by partially reorganizing the Army in accordance with the requirements of defensive operations. Military districts and the headquarters of various group armies are being reduced in size or merged with others. New-style group armies in the Army are being disbanded, and first-line tank divisions and motorized infantry divisions are having their offensive weaponry reduced.

4. Switching from a strategic offensive posture to a strategic defensive posture. Gorbachev has stressed that a strategic defensive is a fundamental type of military operation, and he no longer stresses the role of the strategic offensive posture. Reaction in the West indicates that this guiding philosophy has begun to be manifested in Soviet military training and maneuvers. Since 1985, the tendency to emphasize defensive operations in Soviet military maneuvers has grown increasingly pronounced. Furthermore, in their counterattack stage, these types of maneuvers have generally been limited to recovering the original defensive posture. They no longer include any intention to penetrate enemy territory.

5. Switching from sending troops to foreign countries to reducing some forces stationed abroad. For a long time, the Soviet Union pursued a strategy of global offensive. It sent large numbers of troops to foreign countries and established forward deployments, which are offensive in nature, on its western, eastern, and southern fronts. In recent years, the Soviet Union has gradually begun to withdraw its troops from abroad and has reduced its troop strength along the Sino-Soviet border. Its decision to reduce troops by 500,000 will be carried out by the end of 1990 by withdrawing 240,000 troops from the West, 200,000 from the East, and 60,000 from the South.

Amidst Change, Some Things Remain the Same

The general view is that adjustment of military strategy is not something that the Soviet Union can achieve overnight. It will be quite a long process, and will at times touch upon fundamental interests. The Soviet Union will not make changes at the drop of a hat, so this adjustment has so far been limited. This is due to the following reasons:

First, the basic strategic aims of the Soviet Union have not changed. Although the Soviet Union claims that Soviet-U.S. relations have entered a stage of "cooperation," and that the Soviet Union no longer views the United States as the "enemy," the United States is still the principle

adversary of the Soviet Union. The global struggle between the two parties, focused on Europe, has not come to an end.

Second, the theoretical preparation for adjustment of military strategy by the Soviet Union is not yet complete. The actual implications of the "purely defensive" character of the military theory put forward by the Soviet Union, and of the concept of "reasonable and sufficient" force are still a matter of debate in the Soviet Union and clear consensus is lacking. At the same time, the "low-level parity" proposed by the Soviet Union could be very advantageous to countries other than the United States.

Third, the Soviet military still maintains a large and powerful offensive force. This is an important strength which it relies on to continue pursuing its superpower politics, and the Soviet Union will not lightly give it up. Although the Soviet Union has decided to reduce its troops by 500,000, this represents only about 10 percent of total troop strength, and its 3-in-1 offensive nuclear force has not been greatly reduced. What is more, the Soviet Union is still vigorously upgrading its weaponry, developing cutting-edge conventional weapons, stepping up research on space technology, guided energy technology, and antisatellite technology, and aggressively deploying a new generation of nuclear weapons.

Fourth, the forward-deployed offensive posture of the Soviet Union has not been fundamentally changed. The Soviet Union still has large numbers of troops stationed in Eastern Europe, and its troops stationed in Mongolia have not yet been withdrawn, either. The Soviet Navy still maintains naval patrol forces in the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean Sea, and it will not give up its base in Cam Ranh Bay for some time. Although the Soviet troops have been withdrawn from Afghanistan, the Soviet Union has not given up its strategic interests there.

It is generally felt abroad that adjustment of the Soviet Union's military strategy has just begun. It is subject to constraints from foreign countries (mainly the United States) as well as the limitations of various domestic factors and the influence of traditional military thinking. The road of readjustment is going to be long and rocky.

SHIJIE ZHISHI Views Soviet Military Spending, Trends

*HK1105122090 Beijing SHIJIE ZHISHI
in Chinese No 8, 16 Apr 90, p 23*

[Article by Zhou Wei (0719 4850): "How Much Do You Know About the Military Spending of the Soviet Union?"]

[Text] For many years, it was generally believed that the military spending published by the Soviet authorities was not the real military expenditure of the Soviet Union, which was always kept secret. The Western countries tried by every possible means to collect information about the Soviet Union's military spending, and

various major research institutions and experts concerned in the world also made great efforts to calculate and estimate the real figure. In 1989, the Soviet Union for the first time made public its real military spending, but people still doubted its credibility.

According to the announcements of the Soviet authorities before 1989, the military spending from 1970 to 1984 was 17 billion rubles each year; that from 1985 to 1986 was 19.1 billion rubles each year; and that in 1987 and 1988 was 20.2 billion rubles each year. The Soviet Union is a superpower. It was unimaginable that it could maintain a huge armed forces with more than 4 million people with such a modest amount of money. At the session of the People's Congress last June, the Soviet Union for the first time made an unprecedented announcement to reveal the 1989 military expenditure totaling 77.3 rubles and accounting for 8.5 percent of gross national production. Late last year, the Soviet Union again announced that its 1990 military expenditure would total 70.976 billion rubles and account for 7.5 percent of gross national production and 11 percent of the national income. Although some people still doubt the credibility of these figures, international opinion generally held that the figures were close to the real fact.

Formation of Military Spending

According to the details about the military spending in 1990 made public by the Soviet authorities, the military expenditure is composed of six parts:

First, expenses for weapons and equipment. This accounts for 44 percent of the total military expenditure and constitutes the largest item.

Second, expenses for maintaining the troops. This accounts for 27 percent of the total military spending and can be divided into two items: 1) the wages paid to the military personnel and workers in the military institutions, accounting for about one-third; and 2) the material and technical maintenance expenses and military training expenses, accounting for the other two-thirds.

Third, expenses for military-purposed scientific research, accounting for 19 percent of the total military spending.

Fourth, expenses for military construction. This amount is used to build housing for the troops and to build various welfare and service facilities needed in the daily lives of the troops. This item accounts for about 5 percent of the total military spending.

Fifth, expenses for paying pensions to retired soldiers, accounting for 3.3 percent.

Sixth, other miscellaneous expenses, accounting for 1.7 percent.

People also noticed that in the military expenses announced by the Soviet authorities, the expenses for the military-purposed astronautical operation were not

included. For example, in 1989, the Soviet Union spent a total of 6.9 rubles on astronautics activities; and of this amount, 3.9 rubles served military purposes.

Comparison With Things in the United States

During the Reagan administration, the annual average military spending of the United States exceeded \$300 billion. The U.S. military spending slightly decreased to \$291.6 billion in 1989. However, if the Soviet military spending in 1989 was converted into a comparable currency, it would be just about \$120.2 billion, that is, less than half of the U.S. military spending. This showed a wide gap between the two sides. In 1990, the U.S. military spending was set at \$299.2 billion while the Soviet military spending was set at merely \$114.477 billion, according to the TASS report, and the gap became even wider.

If the military experts compare the formation of the military expenditure on the two sides, they will find that the Soviet Union and the United States spend money in very different ways and achieve different results. This is mainly reflected in two aspects:

The personnel costs of the Soviet military forces are much lower than those on the U.S. side. According to General Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, the wages of U.S. officers are six to eight times as much as those of Soviet officers of the same ranking; and the allowances for American soldiers are ten times as much as those for Soviet soldiers. The personnel expenses (including wages and related items) account for about 45 percent of the U.S. military expenditure. According to this rate, the personnel expenses in the U.S. Armed Forces in 1990 will reach \$134.6 billion while the same expenses in the Soviet Armed Forces will be less than \$15 billion.

The weapons of the Soviet Armed Forces are much cheaper than those of the U.S. Armed Forces. Because the profits of the war industry in the Soviet Union are fixed by the state, and the costs of raw materials and labor services in these enterprises are relatively low, weapons can be produced at low costs in the Soviet Union. Not long ago, Soviet Defense Minister General Yazov told U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT that the costs of the weapons used by the Soviet armed forces were merely one-quarter of the costs of the weapons in the West. For example, each of the "Leopard" tanks made by West Germany costs \$2 million, but each of the comparable "T-80" tanks made by the Soviet Union cost only \$500,000. Moiseyev also said that the U.S. Armed Forces had to pay nine times the amount paid by the Soviet armed forces for purchasing the same cruiser and pay 11 times the amount paid by the Soviet armed forces for purchasing the same helicopter. The expenses for purchasing weapons account for one-third of the U.S. military expenditure and are set at \$98.7 billion in 1990; while similar expenses in the Soviet Union will be merely \$50.3 billion. According to the rate provided by Yazov,

by spending some \$50 billion the Soviet Union can buy twice the weapons bought by the United States with \$100 billion.

This shows that the Soviet military expenses can achieve greater results. This was the reason the Soviet Union could spend less money but build up military strength comparable with that of the United States. Although the Soviet military spending was much less than that of the United States, it still ranked second in the world.

The Tendency of Development

Military spending is a major indicator of a country's military strength and defense policy. Recently, the Soviet Union decided to reduce its military spending by 8.2 percent in 1990—after the 1.5 percent reduction in 1989—and to make a further cut in 1991. In two years, the Soviet Union will reduce 500,000 troops and will also reduce the orders for weapons and military equipment as well as military-purposed scientific research projects. Soviet Prime Minister Ryzhkov announced that by 1995, the proportion of the military expenditure in the total state budget of the Soviet Union will be lowered to 7.5 percent.

Of course, although the Soviet Union is cutting down on its military spending, it has not relaxed efforts to consolidate its national defense. According to the defense principle of "being reasonable and sufficient," the Soviet Union is pursuing the policy of positively raising the quality of the armed forces and the policy of "conducting more research and development and conducting less production," thus the limited military budget can be concentrated on the sophisticated projects.

U.S. Planned Military Adjustments in Pacific Noted

*HK0905132190 Beijing JIEFANGJUN BAO
in Chinese 23 Apr 90 p 3*

[Article by Chen Linhai (7225 2651 3189) and Wu Xinzheng (0702 2450 2973): "U.S. Armed Forces To Make Major Adjustments in Military Bases in the Pacific Ocean"]

[Text] In early April, the U.S. Department of Defense submitted to Congress an assessment of U.S. military presence in East Asia. The report primarily dealt with U.S. adjustments in the Pacific region and the selection of a reserve military base site.

The Pentagon believes that the U.S. Armed Forces should pull out from South Korea since the South Korean people strongly oppose the U.S. military presence. The Pentagon also believes that the South Korean armed forces are capable of taking up the responsibility for their defense. In addition, the gap between the United States and the Philippines remains wide on the issue of the United States continuing to employ the latter's military bases; most likely, the U.S. Armed Forces will have to pull out from the Clark Air Base and

Subic Bay. Therefore, the Pentagon must select an appropriate reserve military base in the Pacific region. Presently, unofficial consideration has already been given to some reserve bases, including Hawaii, Singapore, Japan, Okinawa, and Guam.

U.S. military experts believe that a reserve military base must meet two conditions: A deep water dock to berth aircraft carriers and enough airspace for Air Force exercises. A U.S. Department of Defense official pointed out that Guam is possibly the most suitable site for a reserve military base. Geographically, Guam is the westernmost U.S. territory in the Pacific, and is located at the juncture of the shipping lanes to the ports of Korea, Hawaii, Japan and the Philippines. The choice of Guam as a reserve base will not be restricted by external conditions but to those conditions that are favorable to the command of U.S. armed forces.

Economically, Guam is, to the U.S. Armed Forces, a region of the strongest economic strength in the Pacific. Presently, it has sufficient goods and equipment in every category to meet the needs of the U.S. Navy for scores of years. Guam was occupied by Japan from 1941 to 1944. Later, Admiral Nimitz of the U.S. Seventh Fleet and his troops recovered the island. Since then, Guam has become a supply base to the U.S. Armed Forces in the Pacific. Guam is also where the U.S. Mariana Navy Headquarters, and regional joint defense center are located. Permanent offices of military representatives of the U.S. Pacific Fleet, the Federal States of North Mariana, the Federal States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Belau are stationed there; consequently, all relevant issues regarding regional joint defense can be promptly and harmoniously resolved there.

Guam has great advantages as a reserve military base. Presently, the U.S. Navy and Air Force have built numerous military installations on the island.

The U.S. Navy has set up naval ship repair facilities and a large naval depot at Apra Harbor. Auxiliary ships consisting the submarine tender "Nereus," the ammunition ship "Haleakala," and the combat store ships "San Jose," "Niagara Falls" and "White Plains" are stationed there. They can efficiently supply all the maritime supplies needed by U.S. naval formations in that sea area. Expanding this basis will shorten the building period, and save lots of defense spending.

Of course, Guam as a military base has its limitation, namely, the sparse population on the island. The original military installations already employ the available labor force on the island. The expansion of the naval and air force bases will make labor force shortage keenly felt. However, Pentagon officials believe that when the time comes a voluminous labor force can be invited overseas. For example, the Filipino workers serving the Clark Airbase and Subic Bay can be transferred to serve on Guam.

Since last October, the United States has made a series of military adjustments on Guam. For example, Anderson

Airbase, which originally belonged to the U.S. Strategic Air Command, is now under the jurisdiction of the Pacific Air Force and the Pacific Air Forces' 633d Air Corps has already taken over the airport from the No. 43 Bomber Unit under the Strategic Air Command. These changes may be the results of cuts in the 1990 defense budget, but precisely meet the requirements for adjusting the U.S. military bases in the Pacific region. Presently, the U.S. Air Force is studying whether Anderson Airbase should have a larger airspace than the Agana Naval Airstation to meet the needs of training naval air units. In the latter half of this year, a new air unit comprising eight ES-3A aircraft are to be dispatched to the Agana airport to reinforce the P-3 anti-submarine group stationed there. U.S. military analysts believe that these moves could possibly be an omen that the Pentagon will set up a reserve military base on Guam.

Envoy Urges Halt to Arms Race at UN Session

OW0905005290 Beijing XINHUA in English
2345 GMT 8 May 90

[Text] United Nations, May 8 (XINHUA)—Chinese Ambassador Hou Zhitong reiterated today that the superpowers, which possess the largest arsenals, have a special responsibility for halting the arms race and realizing disarmament.

Speaking this morning at the 1990 session of the UN Disarmament Commission, which opened yesterday, the ambassador said the superpowers should not only substantially reduce their armaments, but also stop their qualitative arms race.

"What must be noted," he pointed out, "is that both parties have admitted recently that the target for their strategic nuclear weapons reduction has been curtailed from the original 50 percent to the present 30 percent."

"Even if they have indeed cut such weapons by half, they still own more than 90 percent of the total nuclear weapons in the world, enough to destroy mankind many times," he added.

He said the superpowers, in their negotiations up to now, have kept evading the issue of a qualitative arms race.

"While constantly upgrading their conventional armaments, they are now replenishing their already huge nuclear arsenals with a new generation of nuclear weapons of improved accuracy, penetration and mobility," which "poses a serious threat to world peace and security."

On the issues of preventing nuclear proliferation and the prohibition of nuclear test, he reiterated that "China does not advocate, encourage or engage in nuclear proliferation."

He told the commission that the Chinese Government has decided to give favorable consideration to attending, as an observer, the fourth review conference of the parties to the treaty of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

He reaffirmed that China is opposed to the practice of going all out for the nuclear arms race while refusing to unconditionally provide security assurance to non-nuclear-weapon states on the one hand, and imposing unreasonable restrictions on international cooperation for peaceful uses of nuclear energy in the name of preventing nuclear proliferation on the other.

As to naval armaments and disarmament, he pointed out that while negotiating to reduce nuclear and conventional armaments, the world's leading naval powers have continued their naval arms race and their rivalry in the oceans. The "gunboat policy" remains a threat to many countries.

"Naval disarmament forms an important integral part of the nuclear and conventional disarmament and should be addressed without delay," the ambassador emphasized.

He said that "since disarmament and security are issues having a direct bearing on the vital interest of all countries, all of them, big or small, strong or weak, have an equal right and are invariably entitled to participate in the discussion and settlement of these issues."

He said in conclusion that bilateral disarmament efforts and those involving a small number of countries are welcome, but they should not be used to belittle, reject or replace the global multilateral efforts.

JAPAN

Okinawa Governor Welcomes U.S. Troop Reduction

*OW0205114490 Naha OKINAWA TIMES in Japanese
20 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 2*

[Text] The U.S. Defense Department has prepared and submitted to the U.S. Congress a report entitled "A Strategic Framework for the Asia-Pacific Region: Looking Toward the 21st Century." The report clearly states that troops will be reduced by 6,000, mainly of the U.S. Marine Corps units stationed in Okinawa, and that unnecessary bases will be returned at an early stage. Concerning this plan, Governor Nishime said on the afternoon of 19 April: "This is what we have been repeatedly demanding, and we welcome this decision by the U.S." Then, he reiterated the prefectural government's hope that actual names of facilities to be returned would be clarified soon.

Moreover, Governor Nishime stated: "In working out the third promotional program, as one of the important tasks for the prefectural government, we shall prepare a plan to use the land formerly used by military bases, based on the assumption that a large-scale reduction and overall review of the U.S. bases will be made in the near future, so that we shall not be forestalled." Thus, he explained his determination to seriously tackle the issues on expected large-scale return of U.S. bases in Okinawa [USFO], and on the use of this land.

On the other hand, if the bases are returned, the prefectural government will be required to take comprehensive administrative measures, including plans to deal with land owners and workers originally employed by the U.S. Forces in Japan [USFJ]. Thus, the prefectural government thinks that the Japanese Government should also actively deal with these tasks, holding that "the tasks of promoting proper use of this land, and taking measures to deal with former USFJ employees are also very important," and that "they have to be taken into consideration simultaneously."

At a regular prefectural assembly session in February, Governor Nishime touched on the preparation of a plan to use the former base land, and disclosed his views on this issue for the first time in an official forum. He said: "I shall ask relevant city, town, and village governments to work out plans, during fiscal 1990, for use of the land where the Onna-son communications facilities, the Naha military port, the Futenma Air Station, and other base facilities are located."

Moreover, the Governor said: "We shall consult with the cities, towns, and villages regarding the utilization plans submitted by the Gun-Ten-Kyo [the Association for Promotion of Diversion of Land Formerly Used as Military Bases] concerning the use of the land where 20 base facilities are located." Thus, he explained his intention to actively tackle plans for using land expected to be returned, while taking into consideration changes in the

international situation. Regarding the basic policies of the prefectural government's management, the Governor said: "While cooperating with city, town, and village governments, and other concerned organizations to work out, at an early date, plans for the use of returned land, I would like to improve the system so that it can appropriately cope with future changes in the situation." He also indicated his understanding that the detente between the United States and the Soviet Union would have an impact on the Far East, and that, as a result, the "epoch-making" return of the USFO bases might be realized in the near future.

The Gun-Ten-Kyo (with Governor Nishime serving as chairman) has worked out a list of requests concerning the return of bases, including 12 facilities located in eight cities, towns, and villages, their total land area covering more than 2,000 hectares. If they are actually returned, it would be difficult for the current administrative structure of the prefectural government to deal with the use of land formerly used as bases. It seems that a large-scale organizational reform is needed to promote the use of this land so that it can act in concert with city, town, and village governments.

The recent U.S. Defense Department report clearly shows that surges of reorganization and reduction of the U.S. Forces have reached all the Asia-Pacific region, including Okinawa. In order to adequately respond to rapid changes regarding base issues, it will be necessary for the prefectural government to extend the special law on promoting the development of Okinawa. At the same time, on the basis of this law, the prefectural government should positively try to include in the third promotion program, such comprehensive measures as plans for using the returned land, for settling employment issues for former USFO employees, for promoting urban development programs, and for developing the local economy, and it should also try to review the administrative system.

SOUTH KOREA

Weapons Purchased Under 'Less Favorable Terms'

*SK2904161290 Seoul TONG-A ILBO in Korean
24 Apr 90 p 5*

["Focus" column by Pang Hyong-nam: "Korea Purchases Weapons From the United States Under Unfavorable Terms—Examples Shown in U.S. Department of State Data"]

[Text] In purchasing expensive weapons from the United States, Korea has signed purchasing contracts under terms much less favorable than other countries.

It is a custom in international weapons deals for exporting countries to provide importing countries with offsets by allowing importing countries to supply weapons parts and other goods to exporting countries in

return for such weapons deals. However, Korea has had offsets less favorable than other countries.

Recent data of the U.S. Department of State show that during the 1980-1987 period, Korea imported weapons worth \$1.0558 billion, an equivalent of approximately 739 billion won, from 50 U.S. munitions corporations, and that, in return for this, the United States imported Korean goods worth \$488 million. This shows that the proportion of offsets for Korea to the amount of deals is only 46.2 percent. This is much less than those for Great Britain, Canada, Spain, and other major countries that import U.S. weapons, and less than the average of those for all the countries that import U.S. weapons, that is, 57 percent.

During the same period, Spain imported weapons worth \$2.1513 billion from the United States and exported goods worth \$2.8511 billion, 132.5 percent, to the United States in return for its import of weapons. Also, Great Britain exported goods worth an equivalent of 105.3 percent of the amount of its weapons imports. During the same period, 50 U.S. munitions corporations exported weapons worth \$34.8169 billion and imported, in the form of offsets, goods worth \$19.9291 billion, 57.2 percent of the total amount of exports, from countries that imported U.S. weapons.

It was learned that Korea will agree on an offset of somewhere around 30 percent in concluding the Korean Fighter Program [KFP] to buy F-18's. This shows that terms for Korea's imports of weapons are worsening. The Korean Ministry of Defense explains that we have no choice but to have a less favorable offset because F-18's, which we will import according to the KFP, are equipped with state-of-the-art gadgets and therefore, the United States is reluctant to transfer its technology. However, this is not convincing.

It is difficult to understand this also in view of the fact that, when importing Airborne Warning And Control System planes, Great Britain got an offset of no less than 130 percent of the price of the planes. Also, for some countries, offsets cover sectors that have nothing to do with military sectors. For example, when importing F-16 fighters from General Dynamics, Turkey not only was allowed to participate in the joint manufacturing of F-16's and to export its goods to the United States, but also received U.S. assistance in building houses, schools, and mosques.

Therefore, Korea must more actively hold negotiations to get a favorable offset when importing expensive weapons from the United States. It is pointed out that this is necessary to increase our exports and to reduce our defense budget, which is appropriated by people's taxes.

Of course, Senator Alan Dixon, a Democrat, to the contrary, presented a bill that calls for reducing offsets. However, offsets for Korea are much lower than the average of U.S. offsets for all the countries.

Exports of Weapons of 50 U.S. corporations during the 1980-1987 period (unit \$1 million)

Country	Amount of Exports	Offset	Proportion of Offsets to Amount of Deals
Great Britain	1.8008	1.8965	105.3%
Canada	3.8741	3.0242	78.1%
Egypt	0.3830	0.0878	22.9%
Israel	6.0837	1.3842	22.8%
NATO members	0.6674	0.3204	48.0%
Korea	1.0558	0.4880	46.2%
Spain	2.1513	2.8511	132.5%
Sweden	0.3817	0.6633	173.8%
Switzerland	0.3709	0.2485	67.0%
TOTAL	34.8169	19.9291	57.2% (average)

MONGOLIA

Soviet Troop Withdrawal To Begin Mid-May

OW0705100490 Ulaanbaatar International Service
in English 0910 GMT 7 May 90

[Text] Commander of Soviet troops in Mongolia Lieutenant General Mayorov has announced at a press conference in Ulaanbaatar that the planned Soviet troops move-out will start in the mid of May and finish in August this year. Within this second stage, 26,800 Soviet soldiers and (?instructors) will be withdrawn from Mongolia together with their technical units.

The Soviet general noted that the complete withdrawal of Soviet troops from Mongolia will end in 1992.

PHILIPPINES

Soviet Envoy on U.S. Troop Reduction in Asia

HK0805082990 Hong Kong AFP in English 0812 GMT 8 May 90

[Text] Manila, May 8 (AFP)—The Soviet ambassador to the Philippines Tuesday urged Washington to substantially reduce its military forces in Asia and enter into talks on a political mechanism guaranteeing the region's security.

"There is no Soviet threat in the region or to the region. I think that no one can seriously talk about that anymore," Ambassador Oleg Sokolov said a week ahead of talks on the future of U.S. air and naval bases in the Philippines. Noting that planned U.S. troop reductions in Asia due to budgetary problems would be "minimal and even symbolic," he said, "I think they could do better, and I profoundly hope that they would."

The Philippines hosts Clark Air Base and Subic Naval Base, the largest U.S. military facilities abroad. Exploratory talks on a U.S. request to extend their lease beyond September 1991 are set to start here on Monday.

"Of course we would favor (a U.S. pullout) and of course we would encourage whatever contribution others make in that same realm and for that same goal," Mr Sokolov said. But he acknowledged that the bases issue was a bilateral one between Manila and Washington, and said a total Soviet pullout from Vietnam's Cam Ranh Bay will proceed even if the American facilities stay.

He said Moscow "temporarily" left at Cam Ranh "between six and 10 planes which are of non-offensive character," which would eventually be withdrawn.

"The best way would be to have a balanced reduction involving all categories of weapons," Mr Sokolov said. He said the U.S. insistence "not to reduce its naval strength" was "something we don't understand and don't approve of." Washington has rejected previous Soviet proposals for a mutual pullout from Asia, saying Moscow would have the edge in such an arrangement because it is a land power, while the United States is a sea-based power.

The commander-in-chief of U.S. forces in the Pacific, Admiral Huntington Hardisty, wrote recently that Washington must maintain its military presence in Asia through the next century in order to maintain regional stability. U.S. officials have lately been playing down the Soviet threat and have acknowledged the pullout from Cam Ranh, while warning that other countries might step into a vacuum created by an American pullout.

Mr Sokolov reiterated Moscow's call for the United States to join the Soviets and Asia-Pacific nations in discussing the creation of a regional political forum for security, and said the sooner it was set up the better. "There is not even an attempt that is being made to sit or discuss all these concerns and grievances and problems," he said.

Citing talks on the reunification of Germany, he said the European example "shows beyond any doubt that where there is such a mechanism even the most difficult solutions are usually found."

Mr Sokolov sought to portray Soviet military reductions in Asia as far ahead of any U.S. cutbacks, and said "we hope that the others would follow the example and heed the prevailing situation." He said that out of the 500,000 men Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev promised to take out of the Soviet Armed Forces, 200,000 would be removed from the Asian frontier. He said that following

Chinese Premier Li Peng's recent visit to Moscow, the two powers would start talks on "drastically reducing to a minimum" their border forces, probably to the extent that only border guards would remain.

THAILAND

Purchase of PRC Antiship Missiles Approved

BK3004005490 Bangkok *THE NATION* in English
30 Apr 90 p 1

[Text] The Cabinet has approved a request by the Royal Thai Navy (RTN) to spend more than Bt [Baht] 1 billion to buy anti-ship missiles from China to equip its Chinese-made frigates, sources in the Government House said over the weekend. The sources said the Cabinet approved the purchase of the C-801 surface-to-surface missiles during its weekly meeting on April 17. The arms purchase plan has not been officially disclosed.

The RTN had signed contracts to buy six frigates from China to replace its aging fleet. When the RTN agreed to buy the Chinese frigates in 1988, Navy Commander in Chief Adm [Admiral] Praphat Kritsanachan said they would be fitted with western weapon systems which are far more advanced and reliable than China's.

There has been no official explanation from the navy as to why it has chosen to buy the C-801 missiles but it is generally understood that China is offering Thailand a bargain. The sources said the purchase of the missiles, which arms experts say resemble the French-made Exocet in external appearances, is a government-to-government deal.

The sources, who are familiar with arms procurements by the military, did not say how many missiles, which are sometimes referred to as "Eagle Strike 6," will be bought under the deal which is worth over US\$40 million (Baht1 billion). The missiles will be paid for in five installments between 1990 and 1994. China currently uses the C-801s aboard navy ships and for coastal defence.

The sources said Adm Praphat will represent the Thai Government in signing the deal with China.

Prime Minister Chatchai Chunhawan first asked the Cabinet to approve funds for the arms deal last September when he also served as defence minister. The proposal was re-submitted by Gen [General] Chawalit Yongchaiyut after he became defence minister last month. The six Chinese frigates ordered by the RTN represent the first military hardware the navy has bought from China.

INTERBLOC AFFAIRS

No Agreement on Key 'Open Skies' Issues

*LD0405195690 Budapest MTI in English
1720 GMT 4 May 90*

[Text] Budapest, May 4 (MTI)—The Budapest phase of the Open Skies conference will draw to an end on May 10, as scheduled. One thing that seems certain even now is that the participants will not be able to reach agreement on the details of the contract relating to the free monitoring flights by this date, said Tibor Toth, head of the Hungarian delegation, at the Friday [4 May] press conference.

Mr Toth added that the negotiating sides had made considerable progress in several areas, but no agreement was reached in the key issues.

The Hungarian Foreign Ministry will nonetheless maintain its offer to host the next phase of the negotiations as well until agreement is also reached in the open questions. A decision on the potential continuation of the conference in Budapest is only due in early June.

The closing plenary session on Thursday will be open to representatives of the states participating in the conference as observers.

The leaders of the four working groups also gave a short account of the negotiation results so far. John Nobel, leader of the Canadian delegation, said no agreement was reached on the plane models to be used for the control flights. It was generally thought that the country that would fly the plane should be allowed to select the model. The Soviet Union, however, maintained that the right of choice should be given to the country over which the flight would take place.

There was also a debate on the sensors to be used during the monitoring flights. The participants reached agreement on using sensors that can work amid all types of weather conditions and are capable of monitoring round the clock.

The sides failed to reach agreement on the quantity and precise technical level of the instrumentation on board the planes. There were some countries who said no restrictions should be included in the contract on this point.

Another controversial issue concerned the utilization of the information obtained during the monitoring flights. According to one position, the data should be open to all the parties that signed the agreement. Others say that the information should be available only for the country that carried out the monitoring flight.

The Bulgarian delegation leader Neicho Neichev, head of the team in charge of distributing the flying quotas, said the outline of the mechanism of distributing the quotas and regulating the flights was expected to be drawn up by next week.

At the same time, there were considerable differences of views on the territories the monitoring flights would cover. The controversial question was whether the foreign military bases of the participating states would fall under the scope of the agreement.

Jozef Sesztak, head of the Czechoslovak delegation and leader of the team in charge of flight conditions, said prolonged debates were to be expected on flight conditions and air safety.

The Dutch F.P.R. [expansion unknown] Vaan Nouhuys, head of the legal committee, said the committee under his leadership was engaged in laying down the legal conditions for the political and technical questions involved in the Open Skies system.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Soviet Soldiers, Tanks Withdraw 4 May

*LD0405174190 Prague CTK in English 1524 GMT
4 May 90*

[Text] Prague, May 4 (CTK)—A total of 17,287 Soviet soldiers and 8,660 family members left Czechoslovak territory by four GMT today [4 May].

Also withdrawn were 403 tanks, 649 armoured vehicles, 236 guns and mortars, 18 launching pads, 92 helicopters and 4,111 lorries.

Bush Arms Initiative 'New and Positive Step'

*LD0405170990 Bratislava Domestic Service
in Slovak 1000 GMT 4 May 90*

[Excerpts] [Announcer] The new initiative of U.S. President George Bush, announced at a news conference in Washington yesterday, on halting the modernization of U.S. short-range missiles and short-range artillery in Europe aroused great interest all round the world. Editor Peter Susko comments: [passage omitted]

[Susko] In our country we cannot remain indifferent to the George Bush initiative. First, NATO's original plans were to replace 88 Lance missiles with a range of 112 km with 389 surface-to-air missiles with a range of over 400 km.

Second, the new U.S. proposals are a new and positive step toward the swift convening of an all-European conference on security and cooperation and its successful completion.

In this regard we cannot remain indifferent to the Germany issue because, according to FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, disarmament in Europe is the primary prerequisite of German unification.

It is true that for some NATO states such optimism is unacceptable. Here is a quote from the British DAILY EXPRESS: Caution is necessary. The West is giving up the shield that has protected peace for so long.

It would be more fitting to call the new initiative a crack in the shield, because Lance missiles will still remain in Europe, and their fate will be decided at the next NATO summit at the end of June or at the beginning of July.

Let us believe that this truly important U.S. step will be followed by further steps that will allow Europe to breathe freely without the phantoms of nuclear mushrooms.

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

EppeImann on NATO Membership, Soviet Troops

*AU0205102590 Hamburg BILD in German
2 May 90 p 4*

[Interview with Defense and Disarmament Minister Rainer EppeImann by Peter Brinkmann; place and date not given: "EppeImann: Bonn Must Pay For Red Army"]

[Text] [Brinkmann] Were you able in Moscow to dispel the reservations about NATO membership of a unified Germany?

[EppeImann] If NATO remains a purely military alliance, the Soviets will reject such membership. If it becomes a political-economic alliance, they will say yes.

[Brinkmann] Will there be joint maneuvers between the National People's Army [NVA] and the Warsaw Pact states in 1990?

[EppeImann] There are always exercises; map exercises, however, rather than field exercises.

[Brinkmann] Who will pay for the deployment costs of the Soviet troops after 2 July?

[EppeImann] That will be the business of the entire government.

[Brinkmann] So, who will pay?

[EppeImann] That is clear—Bonn.

[Brinkmann] For how long will the Soviet troops stay in the GDR?

[EppeImann] That will be discussed at the Vienna disarmament talks and in the "Two-Plus-Four" negotiations.

[Brinkmann] Would it be possible for the Soviets to voluntarily pull out some of their troops before that?

[EppeImann] That probably cannot be expected.

SCUD-B Missiles Transferred to Soviet Union

*LD0305164290 East Berlin ADN International Service
in German 1529 GMT 3 May 90*

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—The operational-tactical missile complex 9K72 (NATO code "SCUD-B") has been removed from the weaponry and combat strength of the

GDR's NVA [National People's Army], the Disarmament and Defense Ministry announced today. The missiles, launchers, as well as the other apparatus belonging to the ground-based equipment, were handed over to the Soviet side in April 1990. It was transferred to Soviet territory. This measure is based on a decision made by the GDR Government in January 1990.

Report on U.S. Air-to-Ground Missiles

*LD0605125590 East Berlin ADN International Service
in German 1223 GMT 6 May 90*

[Text] Bonn (ADN reporter)—Preparations for the stationing of 389 U.S. air-to-ground nuclear missiles on military airfields in seven European NATO countries are being made at present with the construction of appropriate concrete silos. The Hamburg news magazine DER SPIEGEL reports this in its latest edition. In the middle of the decade, 144 of the modern tactical missiles will be stationed in the Federal Republic of Germany, 33 of them on the Bundeswehr airfields of Buechel, Memmingen, and Noervenich.

According to SPIEGEL, the range of the new nuclear weapon is more than 400 km. The missile could "be started from all current fighter-bombers and achieve the nuclear annihilation of those targets that up to now had only been attainable with medium-range weapons." A follow-up model with a 1,000-km range already is being developed.

The rearmament plans on the air-to-ground nuclear missiles enabled U.S. President George Bush to offer NATO's renunciation of the modernization of short-range nuclear weapons last week, the magazine writes. "Washington only intends to renounce out-dated weapons."

(The report was prereleased to ADN)

HUNGARY

Chief of Staff Borsits Comments on Withdrawal

*LD0505172690 Budapest Domestic Service
in Hungarian 1400 GMT 5 May 90*

[Interview with Chief of Staff Laszlo Borsits by unidentified reporter; place and date not given]

[Excerpts] We have asked Chief of Staff Laszlo Borsits for an explanation of some unconfirmed news. Today [5 May] Radio Free Europe reported that Soviet Colonel-General Burlakov said in a statement to PRAVDA that there were problems concerning the withdrawal of Soviet troops stationed in Hungary. According to Burlakov, it will be difficult to keep to the agreement according to which the last Soviet soldier must leave Hungary by June 1991. We could not find out in which edition of PRAVDA this was, and in precisely what kind of form the statement appeared, but in any case we telephoned the chief of staff.

[Begin recording] [Borsits] I was very surprised by the news. In the intergovernmental agreement signed by the two foreign ministers on 10 March of this year in Moscow, it was laid down that the Soviet troop withdrawal from Hungary's territory must be completed in its entirety by June 30 next year.

In my opinion, what Col-Gen Burlakov has said now is his individual statement. In contrast to this, I can say that the withdrawal, which began on 12 March, has been implemented so far with absolute precision according to our plans, according to the schedule, the scheduled plan.

[Reporter] Except that if we take into account the Soviet troop withdrawal plans, and the timetable, then the great pace of Soviet troop withdrawal lasts precisely from mid-May to say, the end of September. This is when most of them are withdrawing from Hungary. So perhaps this might also be timed, so that Col-Gen Burlakov announces this exactly before the season.

[Borsits] In practice, there is a more intensive withdrawal starting 20 April. The Soviet side undertook this obligation in the agreement, which was made public.

[Reporter] We cannot ignore, either, the Col-Gen's statement, according to which: Negative effects have to be reckoned with in Soviet-Hungarian economic relations, which are already tense today because of the Soviet troop withdrawals.

[Borsits] At the time, it was laid down in the agreement that the questions of economic accounting, and the unsettled nature of economic relations, or their not being entirely settled—a negative effect, as Col-Gen Burlakov put it—according to this, cannot influence the pace of Soviet troop withdrawals. This, in my opinion, is not the affair of the military. [passage omitted]

[Reporter] Mr Borsits, don't you think that with the statement from Col-Gen Burlakov, Hungary and the Hungarian Government has received an indirect political warning? What I am thinking of is that in the given case, the Soviet troops being withdrawn from East Europe, from Hungary, and from Czechoslovakia, could cause serious internal political problems at home. This question could become really problematic alongside the independence of the Baltic countries, when another mass of problems is raining down on the Soviet leadership.

[Borsits] All these factors, were taken into consideration at the time when we were working on the agreement. Naturally, the events in connection with the Baltic republics which have happened since then cannot in my opinion influence the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from the territory of the Hungarian Republic and Czechoslovakia, the ordered and organized implementation of this. I, for my part, am of the opinion that this cannot be interpreted as a message, either to the Hungarian Government or to the military leadership. I interpret this as Col-Gen Burlakov having perhaps expressed his individual opinion in this statement; perhaps he spoke about

this. I would once again say that we have to look precisely at what was said in this statement. [end recording]

POLAND

National Military, Security Position Viewed

PM0405155090 Warsaw TYGODNIK SOLIDARITY
in Polish 16 Mar 90 p 5

[Article by Colonel Julian Kaczmarek, professor at the General Karol Swierczewski Polish Armed Forces General Staff Academy in Warsaw: "Sovereignty and Security"]

[Text] Every state, including ours, has a duty to ensure the inviolability of its borders and security of its citizens. This duty is also specified in the Constitution of the Polish Republic, which states that we are obliged to "stand guard over the sovereignty and independence of the Polish people, its security and peaceful existence, (...) and it is each citizen's most sacred duty to defend his homeland."

An important role in this respect is entrusted to the science of state defense. While investigating the existing state of affairs, its brief is also to establish the principles of the functioning of states and coalitions and to formulate on that basis the laws, rules, forms, and methods of defense action programs. This allows us to define the directions, objectives, and tasks of the state (or coalition) in this respect.

The foundations of the science of state defense were formulated quite a long time ago. It was on that basis that our defense system was built—a system which previously ensured the implementation of the constitutional provisions mentioned in the introduction. Actual political and defense solutions influence this system to a considerable degree. In our case, these take the following aspects into consideration: 1—existing territorial divisions in Europe resulting from the Yalta and Potsdam agreements; 2—the division of our continent into two opposed sociopolitical systems (capitalist and socialist); 3—the existence in each system of combat capabilities (psychological, economic, and military) equivalent to those of the other side.

The aforementioned solutions must also include the following provisions:

- the territorial division line runs along the border dividing the two German states, the FRG and the GDR;
- each system created its own political and military bodies (NATO and the Warsaw Pact), whose combat capabilities have steadily increased during the past 45 years;
- peace on our continent has been maintained chiefly thanks to the principle of the balance of fear.

Although these accepted provisions were instrumental in keeping peace for more than 45 years, the question needs to be asked now whether they should still be taken into consideration. Well, it now emerges that they should not. There are a variety of reasons for this, and I will briefly discuss the major ones below.

The first reason is the amassed military combat potential. Its size and extent mean that a nuclear war in Europe would entail the danger of biological extinction—not only on our continent—and even a conventional war would also threaten a major disaster. This means that no rational person should allow the outbreak of either nuclear or conventional war on our continent. However, it is difficult to exclude the possibility of domestic, civil wars (as in Romania, for example) or short-term armed conflicts or blitzkriegs, as in Grenada or Panama. Given a modicum of imagination and reference to historical precedents (for example, the annexation of Austria and Sudetenland in 1938, or Bohemia and Moravia in 1939,) we cannot exclude the possibility of this type of action today. After all, these marked the beginning of the Third Reich's campaign to enlarge its "Lebensraum." Nor can we ignore the many campaigns being conducted today, which are generally termed non-armed (economic, diplomatic, psychological, informational, scientific and technological, and many others) and which offer the opportunity to achieve political objectives by peaceful means.

The second reason is certainly the recent process whereby the traditionally sharp differences (or, to put it frankly, antagonisms) between the opposed sociopolitical systems are becoming less pronounced. This offers a possibility, on the one hand, to extend the scope of cooperation (in all fields) between individual states on the continent and, on the other hand, to reduce the existing differences.

The next important reason is the recent intensification of the German people's demands for a unification of the two German states. This means that there is a real possibility of the creation of a single German state. However, we must realize that if this comes to pass, a new European superpower will emerge, with the second largest war potential in our continent (after the USSR), on whose territory, according to the Potsdam agreement, the victorious allied armies (British, American, Soviet, and French) are still stationed today.

These factors create a new situation from the viewpoint of international security, and this situation facilitates the formulation of the rules guaranteeing independence, sovereignty, and peace to all European peoples in some respects, but hinders it in others.

The setting-up of parliamentary democracy systems in East European states is doubtless conducive to the preservation of security. The ideological reasons which used to exacerbate the differences between states and coalitions have either disappeared altogether or become seriously diminished and this, in turn, facilitates the construction of the common European home.

This situation makes it imperative to accelerate the solution of the most urgent problem, that is, the elimination of nuclear weapons and reduction of conventional weapons to a level at which no single state can initiate aggressive action; it should only leave a level of forces and resources able to guarantee effective defense, in line with the teaching of the Polish defense doctrine. Consequently, we should strive to ensure that all European states adopt similar guidelines and base their defense systems on those guidelines. The first step in that direction could be made at the Vienna meeting of heads of staff of European state armies, scheduled to take place early this year.

Undoubtedly, the major obstacle to reaching a solution of the international security issue is posed by the German question. Responsibility for resolving this issue lies primarily with the four victorious powers of World War II (the USSR, the United States, Britain, and France,) since they assumed relevant obligations. However, the stance of the states immediately involved (FRG and GDR) and that of the neighbors of the proposed European power must also be considered. For us Poles it is a question of paramount importance.

The most topical aspect of this matter is the formulation of an answer to the following question: What should be done to preclude the possibility of the Germans' provoking the outbreak of a third world war? I think that it is imperative to take suitable steps to prevent such a possibility. From the Polish nation's viewpoint the relevant steps would be of a sociopolitical, economic, and military nature.

After all, life in a common European home implies concern for inviolability of borders and security for the citizens of all states which make up that common home. A common European home also means cooperation and economic assistance. We do not want to become Europe's slaves, nor exclusively its source of raw materials, nor again its "dumping ground." This is because we do not want to be consigned to the servants' quarters in this new home that is now being built. We want to have equal rights and to be able to decide about our future. Moreover, a common European home also means the creation of circumstances in which it would be impossible for any state to keep armed forces, or to develop them within a short time, in a degree which would facilitate aggression. It also means a situation where all kinds of non-armed conflict would be eventually phased out. The idea is that we should preclude the development of a state of affairs similar to that before World Wars I and II or to annexation of other countries' territories brought about by victorious nonarmed conflict.

Invitation to a Debate [boxed note following above article]

We received the text of the above article by Professor Julian Kaczmarek from Lieutenant General Professor Wladyslaw Mroz, commander of the Polish Armed Forces General Staff Academy. As Solidarity exponents, we treat this fact as a signal that Army personnel—who

until now actively collaborated in the creating of the PZPR nomenklatura—are now ready to take part in a popular debate on issues and questions essential to any nation: problems of defense and security. For years on end these issues were kept secret from us Poles, even more than from Western specialists.

The censorship phrase "military secret" in effect embraced a whole system of "Armed Forces secrets," both in the military sense—that is, the technical condition and the tactical, operational, and strategic tasks of the Polish Armed Forces within the framework of the Warsaw Pact—and in the social sense, involving relations between Army personnel and subordinates, the training and indoctrination system, and the brutalization of barracks customs and traditions....

In a democratic country there is no justification for the existence of "special" institutions separated from the population by walls and armed guards. Not even the Army can remain such an institution.

The debate should begin from the point at which Col Kaczmarek ends his reflections. What new European order will emerge from the changes sparked in 1989? The order of Yalta, NATO, the Warsaw Pact, divided Germany, and divided Europe is receding into the past. However, as long as the transformations in the Soviet Union remain unconsolidated, it will be unrealistic to expect that Western Europe and the United States will decide to disband NATO. A united Germany remaining within the pact and a dismantling of the Stalinist bloc of "peoples' democracies" will change the traditional balance of power. Poland may well find itself between Europe and the USSR in more than the military sense.

But does all this mean that we are returning to the situation which existed in the memorable year 1939? Not necessarily. A variety of possible changes can be made in this situation. One such direction is mentioned by Col Kaczmarek: It involves nuclear and conventional disarmament.

The question is whether Poles will be the last remaining gangster of the Warsaw Pact or assume an independent stand—independent, that is, of both the USSR and NATO. Is such independence possible here, in the middle of Europe? There are more questions of this kind and it is high time to embark on the task of answering them.

The "Defense Doctrine of The Polish Republic" announced publicly last February by the National Defense Committee contains two messages: on the readiness of the Army and society to carry out their defense duty and on the readiness to participate on full and equal terms in the military transformations affecting all of Europe. But the document contains not a single paragraph concerning the USSR.

Military concerns are still a delicate matter, but that is even more reason why they should be discussed in a debate that will examine all possible options for changes

advantageous to Poland. TYGODNIK SOLIDARNOSC invites everyone to take part in such a debate.

Siwicki on Reducing Soviet Troops, Security

LD3004133390 Warsaw PAP in English 1205 GMT
30 Apr 90

[Text] Warsaw, April 30—"The 50,000-strong Northern Group of the Soviet Army is part of a grouping ensuring military balance in our region of Europe. That is why general solutions on its further stationing in Poland, in tune with the Polish Government stand, must be and will in the future be part of the process of the shaping of a new European security system," said National Defence Minister Gen Florian Siwicki in an interview for the ZOLNIERZ RZECZPOSPOLITEJ Army daily.

He went on to say:

"It is possible to somewhat reduce the numerical force of these troops and their technical and supply infrastructure already now, which is allowed for by the consolidation of detente tendencies in Europe and by changes in the Soviet doctrine and giving it a fully defensive character. One should recall that we do not start from scratch. Several military units were withdrawn from Poland already last year and the withdrawal of a special task force stationing in Bialogard was planned already then to take place this year.

"Additional and concrete steps will be taken in this process now. As for the town of Brzeg, where two Soviet aircraft units are stationed, one of them will be withdrawn. The town will get about 200 flats. By the end of this year, a Soviet unit will leave facilities and areas it occupied in Torun and about 250 hectares will be conveyed to that town and it will be possible to use them to build new flats there. A helicopter regiment will leave Legnica and be moved to an airport near Kolobrzeg and helicopter squadrons stationing there will be withdrawn from Poland," Siwicki said.

He told the ZOLNIERZ RZECZPOSPOLITEJ Army paper also about the principles of the movement of Soviet troops on Poland's territory.

In a conclusion of his interview, Gen Siwicki said:

"The Republic of Poland is most deeply interested in maintaining peace and security of our borders. The Warsaw Treaty, to observe its 35th anniversary this year, played a significant role in this area of vital importance for the nation, although there are actions in the alliance's history that cannot be regarded as positive. One cannot say that this was a transitory episode in our history but an important factor of national security."

Dubinín on Withdrawal of Soviet Troops

*LD3004190590 Warsaw Television Service
in Polish 1730 GMT 30 Apr 90*

[Text] Lieutenant General Viktor Dubinín, commander of the Northern Group of the Red Army, that is, the commander of all Soviet troops stationed in Poland, told Polish television the following.

[Begin Dubinín recording, in Russian with superimposed Polish translation] A brigade from the landing and assault troops from Białogard will be withdrawn before 1 July. During the summer we will withdraw a supersonic aircraft squadron stationed in Brzeg and a unit from Toruń, where the area which we have occupied will be handed over to the city and a housing development will be constructed there.

At the same time, soldiers will be withdrawn from other Soviet Army units this year. The number of them will, therefore, decrease. It is envisaged that about 5,000 will leave Poland.

The present manpower level of the Soviet Army Northern Group is about 54,000 soldiers and at the end of the year there will be about 48,000 of them. [end recording]

General Siwicki on Soviet Troop Withdrawals

*AU0305115790 Warsaw ZOLNIERZ
RZECZYPOSPOLITEJ
in Polish 30 Apr-1 May 90 pp 1, 3*

[Interview with National Defense Minister Army General Florian Siwicki by Andrzej Jezewski; place and date not given: "With Regard to Security Interests"]

[Text] [Jezewski] Several days ago, Soviet Defense Minister Army General Dmitriy Yazov visited Warsaw. His visit aroused great interest and I would like you, Mr Minister, to give details of the talks that were held at the Ministry of National Defense and which, for obvious reasons, could not be included in the public communications. What was the purpose of General Yazov's visit?

[Siwicki] It was certainly not just a courtesy visit. I invited General Yazov, who was inspecting Soviet units of the Northern Group of Forces, to come to Warsaw to discuss the outcome of the recent meeting between the Polish President, Army General Wojciech Jaruzelski, and President Mikhail Gorbachev.

[Jezewski] It was widely expected that your talks would produce the final decisions on Soviet troop reductions in Poland. Did this happen?

[Siwicki] Yes, this issue took up most of our discussion time. Obviously, as military men, we saw the problem from the point of view of our two countries' security interests. The 50,000-strong Soviet Army Northern Group of Forces is a component of the grouping that

preserves the military balance in our part of the continent. That is why the overall solutions related to the continued stationing of Soviet troops in Poland, and in accordance with our governments' positions must be, and in the future will be, incorporated into the process that is creating a new system of European security.

Nevertheless, certain reductions of forces and their technical and support infrastructure are possible right now. The tendency toward detente in Europe and the changes in Soviet doctrine tending to a defensive character make this possible. It is worth recalling that we are not starting from zero. Last year, several military units were withdrawn from Poland and it was then decided to withdraw the assault brigade stationed in Białogard in 1990. Currently, and within the framework of this process, additional concrete moves will now be proposed.

[Jezewski] What criteria were considered when you came to decide which unit should and which should not be withdrawn?

[Siwicki] Generally, it was the prospect of easing the burden on the local population, although it was clearly impossible to exclude factors of a purely military nature. Brzeg is a good illustration. Two Soviet airforce units are stationed there. In accordance with the agreement, one of these units, a unit that is equipped with very noisy aircraft will be withdrawn. Some of the aircraft will be removed to the Soviet Union and some will stay in Poland, but will be based at a different airfield, an airfield that is situated away from large population concentrations.

[Jezewski] But one of the air regiments will remain in Brzeg.

[Siwicki] Yes. It is not possible to withdraw this unit just yet. It uses less noisy aircraft. Moreover, in accordance with the obligations undertaken by the Soviet side, there will be strict curtailment of flights in order to minimize the inconvenience to the city. For example, the night-flight training program will be carried out in the Soviet Union.

[Jezewski] Apart from the noise reduction, will the city benefit in any other way?

[Siwicki] We anticipate that among other things, about 200 dwellings will be handed over to the city. In view of this, I do not think I have to elaborate how beneficial this decision is for Brzeg.

[Jezewski] What was the decision in relation to the military unit in Toruń?

[Siwicki] Before the end of this year, with the closest cooperation of the Polish Army, this unit will vacate its buildings and land and these will then be handed over to the city. We are talking about some 250 hectares of land which could be designated for housing construction. Similar changes are foreseen for other units, namely, a helicopter regiment will leave Legnica and relocate to an

airfield near Kolobrzeg. The helicopter squadrons stationed there at the moment will leave Poland altogether.

[Jezewski] Did you also discuss the financial and economic issues applicable to the remaining Soviet units?

[Siwicki] We agreed that these are issues that require agreement and decisions at government level. In general, the point of the exercise is to ensure that the conditions applicable to the stationing of Soviet troops should reflect the new social and economic situation in Poland, especially market economy principles.

At the same time and in conjunction with the Ministry of Communications, we have prepared a draft international agreement that will apply to the use of the telecommunications network.

[Jezewski] What are the applicable regulations in relation to coordinating joint action undertaken by the Soviet Army's Northern Group of Forces and the Ministry of National Defense?

[Siwicki] In accordance with the 1957 agreement between our respective governments, the commander of the Northern Group of Forces must inform the minister of national defense of any changes in the composition of the troops under his command at least once every six months. Soviet troops have prearranged transit routes between various military training areas. Permission from Polish authorities is required before any troop movements take place. Some five to seven days before a planned troop movement, the Soviet command informs the Polish Army Main Headquarters of the timing, route, and destination in order to obtain this permission. It also informs us of the composition of these troops.

[Jezewski] As for training exercises, what procedures apply?

[Siwicki] Training maneuvers of Soviet troops beyond their stationing bases can be carried out in accordance with the plans agreed with the Ministry of National Defense. Such agreement must be obtained at least a month before the intended maneuvers.

[Jezewski] Do similar conditions apply to ship movements and aircraft flights?

[Siwicki] Yes. For example let us look at temporary port calls by Soviet warships to the region of their permanent stationing. Each such visit requires notification of the Polish Navy command. This notification must be received no later than 24 hours before the ship's intended arrival. Flights in and over Polish airspace by Soviet aircraft must comply with "The Principles of International Flights by Military Aircraft of Warsaw Pact Member States Through the Airspace of these Countries." The direct coordination of movements in Polish airspace is in the hands of the National Air Defense Forces command.

[Jezewski] Finally, the last question. Many people are asking about the future of the Warsaw Pact and the outlines of cooperation, including military cooperation, between member states.

[Siwicki] I am against the various wide ranging interpretations on this theme, because I look at the question from the angle of the superior interest of the state's security. The preservation of peace and the security of borders is the supreme interest of the Polish Republic. The Warsaw Pact, celebrating its 35th anniversary this year, has played an important role in this field and although in the history of this alliance there have been certain actions which from today's perspective cannot be considered as positive, it cannot be argued that the Warsaw Pact was a passing episode in our history. It was an important factor in our national defense.

There are political forces in Europe that are still interested in weakening the Warsaw Pact. In the meantime, NATO plays an important role in the development and the comprehensive integration of Western Europe. This is of crucial military and political significance. Many European politicians not only want to preserve the Warsaw Pact, but to develop it further. The logic behind this is supported by past and present developments, and will be borne out by the future. Obviously, we cannot ignore the developments in Warsaw Pact member states. That is the reason why we need to strengthen the political character of this alliance and improve its mechanisms of cooperation on the basis of democratic principles. On this point there was full agreement with Defense Minister Yazov.

ARGENTINA

Defunct Condor II Missile Project Discussed

Menem Denies Foreign Pressure

PY2804040290 Madrid EFE in Spanish 0337 GMT
28 Apr 90

[Text] Buenos Aires, 27 April (EFE)—Argentine President Carlos Menem today denied that the paralyzation of the medium-range Condor II missile project was motivated by foreign pressures. Menem said that the reason for the paralyzation is a lack of funds to carry on with the project.

Brigadier General Jose Antonio Julia, the Air Force chief of staff, has said in the city of Cordoba that the manufacturing of the Condor II missile has been paralyzed for more than a year for economic reasons.

In remarks gathered by the official news agency TELAM, Julia added that "Everything that has been said, especially abroad, makes me smile because it is incredible for anyone to think that the project could endanger peace in the Middle East or that it could upset the balance of power."

A source of the Argentine Air Force, who wants to remain anonymous, told EFE on 26 April that the government suspended the construction of the Condor II missile so that they would be able to sell about 500 IA-63 Pampa airplanes to the U.S. Air Force.

The same source said that a U.S. company will sign an agreement with the Argentine Air Force next month to deliver the advanced training Argentine airplane in the United States.

The five prototypes of the Argentine missile were made in a factory located in a forest of Falda del Carmen, Cordoba Province, about 700 km northwest of Buenos Aires.

A spokesman of Colonel Luis Guerrero, head of the project from its inception shortly after the end of the Malvinas war, told a Buenos Aires daily last week that the missile project was suspended because of an agreement with the U.S. government.

Guerrero added that there was an international campaign against the Argentine rocket "because the United States never forgave us for transferring technology to Iraq that permitted that country to build its own missiles in a much shorter time."

Dante Caputo, Argentine foreign minister 1983-1989, admitted in an interview that was published in Buenos Aires last January that the Raul Alfonsin government suffered "all types of pressures" by the United States for the manufacturing of the "Condor II."

The governments of Great Britain and Israel coincided in their criticism of the project for different reasons,

Caputo, 1988 president of the UN General Assembly, admitted. The United Kingdom disseminated a report saying that the Condor II was manufactured by Argentina to attack the "Falkland fortress" on the Malvinas Islands.

Argentina is trying to sell two Meko-360 type rocket-carrying frigates, of German origin, to Iran, and is offering his "pampa" planes and the "TAM" (Argentine Medium-size Tank), a "family" of armored vehicles that includes troop transports.

Daily Provides Technical Profile

PY3004154890 Buenos Aires CLARIN in Spanish
29 Apr 90 p 7

[Report by Daniel E. Arias]

[Text] Everybody is praising and trying to justify the Argentine Condor II project—the only one we had—now that it has officially died, however, a more technical description of the now defunct project will reveal the gap left by our flimsy space project.

According to the type of fuel used, missiles are classified as solid, liquid, and cryogenic-fueled missiles. The solid-fueled missiles carry their fuel (that burns) and the comburent (that supplies the oxygen to trigger the combustion) on a sticky rod, the combustion of which cannot be regulated. The cake burns completely once the combustion starts. Therefore, solid-fueled missiles are difficult to control although they are much simpler and cheaper. Moreover, they can withstand rough handling and can be easily fired. The military prefers this type for manufacturing short-range missiles.

The liquid-fueled missiles carry the fuel and the comburent in completely separate tanks. The two elements meet in a combustion chamber where they ignite after travelling through pipes. Valves make it possible to regulate the power of the engine. Ground personnel are able to stop the engine and restart it in full flight, in short, to control the missile as they wish by radio control.

The cryogenic-fueled missiles were developed during the 1970's and 1980's. They carry hydrogen and liquid gas which are lighter than any other propellant element but are also very expensive to refrigerate and to isolate. This technology makes it possible to build very fast vehicles because of their power-to-weight ratio.

They are used to place huge communication satellites in space some 36,000 km above the equator, or to attack a city from the other side of the world.

Liquid-fueled missiles represent the technology developed during the 1950's and 1960's and, to a certain extent, explain Soviet leadership in space research. These old, heavy, cumbersome, and unbreakable missiles do not have fragile equipment and make it possible to place cargo into outer space at a reasonable cost. On the other hand, the large family of U.S. and European cryogenic-fueled missiles continue at an experimental

stage and are unpredictable (as the case of the space shuttle and the Ariane IV and V). Moreover, they are incredibly costly.

Too poor to even think of developing liquid-fueled missiles, Brazil and Argentina have tried to place solid-fueled vehicles into orbit for decades. This is not all easy because these missiles are really little more than flying rods [canitas voladoras], but the Castor, which was developed by Argentina in 1978, the Sonda IV developed by Brazil, and the Japanese launching devices developed by ISAS (a university space research agency) have proved to be reasonably manageable beasts.

The Castor represented the phase previous to designing a spaceship and this must be the reason why it mysteriously died in 1978 after a series of incredibly successful tests and after having allowed us to reach an agreement for a "joint-venture" with the FRG to study the atmosphere. The absence of mistakes by a debtor country may be fatal.

When Argentina once again started to discreetly think about outer space (1982-1983), it already had enough knowledge to consider larger projects. In fact, with its one-meter-diameter tube, the Condor could place a 200-kg cargo in a low polar orbit of only 200 km.

This project would have allowed Argentina to have one or more pairs of eyes in space so that it could assess its natural resources, predict the water flow of rivers on which hydroelectric dams could be built, determine where it could find oil and uranium, and cheaply stop illegal fishing on the continental shelf. This possibility could not be accepted by some people.

Brazil, which is less restricted, is about to progress from the Sonda IV to the Sonda V and has openly invited us to jointly develop the spaceship. What will Argentina answer? "We will"? Or will it have a chauvinist attitude? What a pity it did not adopt that attitude now that it is letting the Condor project die in its first stage—it was never tested—when the pressure is not as great as it has been. Worst of it all is that it is not receiving anything in exchange.

Very well then, it is accepted, the Condor will go no further. What is left? Very little. Should we develop satellites exclusively for space research to discover the secrets of the sun, or study the cosmic explosions of X-rays. These issues, if unaffected by economic and political factors, do not disturb anybody. NASA is quite willing to give us room, free of charge, on their rockets for these types of satellites. There is no possibility that we will gain either money or space sovereignty. There is no need to point out that any similarity between this possibility and an independent space research program, such as Brazil's, is mere coincidence.

In the 1980's Argentina allowed its nuclear program, which at that time was the most advanced in the Third World, to be hindered. Now it is allowing its wings to be clipped and, with a stupid smile, is foregoing every

opportunity to achieve sovereignty in space. Each attempt to develop technology is labelled arms escalation by those so-called champions of peace, our creditors.

It is quite true, the Condor II may be a missile, as a cargo aircraft may drop bombs and a truck may be equipped with artillery for war. Does this mean that Argentina must stop manufacturing all types of vehicles? This question is not pointless in a country that refuses to make any progress.

Air Force, U.S. Firm To Manufacture Combat Jets

*PY0305144690 Buenos Aires NOTICIAS
ARGENTINAS in Spanish 1900 GMT 2 May 90*

[Text] Buenos Aires, 2 May (NA)—It has been officially reported that the Air Force and an established U.S. company have signed an agreement to manufacture a special version of the Pampa plane. This move will enable the country to compete internationally and to possibly sell almost 900 planes to the United States.

The negotiations to sell the Pampa to the United States began during the previous government and became decisive during a tour by an Argentine delegation to several U.S. Air Force bases.

That delegation was headed by Air Force Brigadier Tomas Rodriguez, the current deputy Air Force commander.

The document that was signed today is an agreement with LTV Aerospace and Defense Company for the joint sale of a "North Americanized" version of the Pampa that will be called Pampa 2000.

The agreement seeks also to win an international tender that will be called by the U.S. Air Force and Naval Air Force, which will replace their fleets of advanced training planes in 1994.

By that date the Military Plane Factory and LTV Aerospace will have produced the version of the Pampa that will compete in the tender.

According to official information, the United States will purchase 890 training units (540 for the Air Force, and 350 for the Naval Air Force) in 1994 and this opens up interesting possibilities for Argentina, because building nearly 900 planes would mean a formidable industrial reactivation.

The Air Force will receive \$800,000 for each of the planes that are sold. The current cost of the Pampa is approximately \$4 million.

The agreement also foresees technological support by the U.S. firm to improve the production line taking into account that LTV Aerospace is the third oldest plane manufacturer in the world, with a plant that employs 11,000 people.

LTV Aerospace currently has a 33-percent participation in the manufacture of the B-2 Stealth [preceding word in English], the most technologically advanced plane in the U.S. Air Force.

The Pampa 2000 will have to compete against strong international adversaries that are also preparing for the tender.

The Italian Aeromacchi plane, the French Alfa jet, the FRG Dornier Enterprise, and the Spanish Casa are among the best known.

According to Ernesto Crespo, the former commander in chief of the Air Force, the Pampa costs less and performs better than the other planes.

The Pampa was flown satisfactorily in the United States in 1988 by very experienced pilots and high ranking Air Force officers.

Navy officers subjected the plane to hard tests including simulated landings on aircraft carriers, where the landing gear takes a bad jolt.

According to some witnesses of that test, the Argentine plane performed without any trouble.

Currently four of these planes are flying, two of them (Gato and Mancha) were the ones that flew to the United States.

The eventual sale of the Pampa plane to the United States opens the door to the NATO countries market because many of their pilots are trained in the United States.

CUBA

Second Stage of Troop Withdrawal From Angola Ends

*FL0305130390 Havana Tele Rebelde Network
in Spanish 1100 GMT 3 May 90*

[Text] The Ministry of the Revolutionary Armed Forces has reported that in accordance with the Bipartisan Agreements signed in New York on 22 December 1988 by Cuba and Angola, 831 internationalist combatants were withdrawn in April. As of 30 April 1990, a total of 33,048 combatants have been withdrawn from the People's Republic of Angola. Our country has thus fulfilled the second stage of the plan.

As our people were told, the withdrawal plan is a month behind schedule because of the unjustified actions of the UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] against Cuban troops which led to the temporary suspension of the withdrawal of Cuban personnel from 25 January to 24 February 1990.

In accordance with the agreements signed, the entire process of the withdrawal of personnel has been controlled by the UN Verification Mission in the People's Republic of Angola.

INDIA

Australian Mirage Jet Sale to Pakistan Opposed

'Lethal Potential' Cited

*BK2504101090 Melbourne Overseas Service in English
0800 GMT 25 Apr 90*

[Text] The Indian Government is to make a formal protest against Australia's decision to sell 50 of its obsolete Mirage military jets to Pakistan. Radio Australia's Canberra office says the authorities in New Delhi will outline their objections to the \$27 million [currency not further specified] deal and its implications for the already strained relations between India and Pakistan by calling in Australia's high commissioner.

Meanwhile, India's high commissioner in Canberra, Mr. Sudarshan Bhutani, says the sale of the mothballed tactical fighters will do nothing to the stabilization of South Asia which he says is the stated aim of Australian foreign policy towards the region. He says in India's view the aircraft have substantial lethal potential.

Australian Envoy Summoned

*BK2504161090 Delhi Domestic Service in English
1530 GMT 25 Apr 90*

[Text] India has expressed its concern over the sale of Mirage aircraft to Pakistan by Australia. An External Affairs Ministry spokesman told newsmen that the Australian high commissioner, Mr Graham Barton Feakes, was summoned to the External Affairs Ministry last evening and was told about India's anguish. The spokesman said that the sale will not contribute to the stabilization of the situation in South Asia which appears to be the stated aim of Australia's policy toward this region.

IRAN

United States Accused of Giving Iraq Chemical Weapons

*NC2204135290 Tehran ABRAR in Persian
10 Apr 90 p 8*

[Political commentary: "A Sword in the Hand of an Inebriated Moor!"]

[Text] In the Name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate.

In a press interview, Saddam, the head of the Iraqi ruling regime, expressed his apprehension over the possibility of straining relations with the United States. He mentioned the names of those who collectively plan to exert pressure in order to mar the deep and cordial relations between Baghdad and Washington.

Saddam's interview took place as Egyptian President Husni Mubarak was concluding his visit to Iraq. This

visit to Baghdad took place in order to convey President George Bush's message to Saddam. Even though the contents of the letter were not divulged, informed sources link Bush's message directly to Saddam's recent radio speech on his official claim of having chemical weapons at his disposal and his ostensible threat to Israel.

In addition to the wave of astonishment it generated in the Western media, Saddam's speech admitting possession of advanced binary chemical weapons also implicates the United States directly in equipping Iraq with these weapons. In view of the fact that no country in the world produces these advanced weapons except the United States and the Soviet Union, Saddam's admitting the fact that he possesses these weapons places the heavy burden of blame directly on the shoulders of those who produce them. The fact that Saddam has committed such a crime against the West probably stems from two factors. One is the discovery of the nuclear trigger devices destined for Iraq, dispatched by the United States at London's Heathrow airport, in retaliation for the execution of the British OBSERVER correspondent. The second is Saddam's mental state resulting from his political failures.

A Western analyst commenting on Saddam said that despite his power-hungry and ruthless dictatorial nature, the Iraqi president has a conspicuous weakness of character. This is that he has surpassed his normal state of mind which borders on lunacy and is in the throes of a difficult condition resulting from his failures. Regardless of whatever the reason may be for Saddam's acknowledging his possession of advanced chemical weapons, the United States had to resort to another of its agents in the region—Mubarak—to find out about Saddam.

Facts and figures indicate that perhaps Bush's prescription has served to draw Saddam out of his mental condition, as Saddam discarded his anti-Western stance after meeting with Mubarak and criticized the international media for its dissemination of his recent speech by saying: We sometimes observe that efforts are made to mar relations between Iraq and the United States.

Following his meeting with Saddam, Mubarak also elaborated: My visit to Iraq was intended to mitigate this tension. He added that he had assured the United States and the Western countries that Iraq is not a country which desires war.(!)

Meanwhile, it may be said that whether Saddam admitted possession of advanced chemical weapons as a result of a temporary bout of insanity or whether it emanated from his power lust in the region and the Arab world, it is for the world public opinion to ponder over the dangers of the issue and wonder why the United States or sources close to it have placed advanced binary chemical weapons in the hand of a criminal with a past record.

Gulf Air, Naval Maneuvers Planned for May
LD2804095890 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian
0740 GMT 28 Apr 90

[From the "Holy Defense" program]

[Text] In order to achieve greater military and defense preparedness and bring about more extensive coordination among the armed forces, major naval and air maneuvers code-named the Sahand maneuvers will be held in the waters of the Persian Gulf during the second half of Ordibehesht [21 April-21 May], with the participation of units from the Naval and the Air Forces of the Islamic Republic of Iran's Armed Forces, and a unit of the Islamic Revolution Guards Corps Naval Forces.

God willing, we will provide you with more detailed reports about the maneuvers while they are in progress.

IRAQ

Official Comments on Nuclear Weapons, Israel

JN0205195990 Baghdad INA in Arabic 1830 GMT
2 May 90

[Text] Geneva, 2 May (INA)—Iraq has urged the international community to take practical measures under the auspices of the United Nations toward declaring the Middle East region an area free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction. Iraq said this must be implemented with effective international supervision.

This came in a speech delivered in Geneva today by 'Abd-al-Rahim al-Kital, Iraqi ambassador to Austria and head of the Iraqi delegation to the third session of the preparatory committee for the fourth review conference of signatories to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty [NNT].

The head of the Iraqi delegation also called on the international community to work to make all Middle Eastern countries, especially "Israel" sign the NNT and place their nuclear installations under International Atomic Energy Authority [IAEA] supervision.

'Abd-al-Rahim al-Kital stressed that practical and rapid measures must be taken by countries possessing nuclear weapons to spare the world the dangers of a nuclear holocaust, through the signing of a new treaty providing for a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing. He added that the nuclear powers that are signatories to the NNT must provide effective guarantees to protect the security of countries that do not have nuclear weapons [words indistinct]. Guarantees must be given to these countries to ensure that countries without nuclear weapons are not made the target of nuclear attack and that they will not be threatened with nuclear attack by any party. In this context, he pointed out that the gravest danger in the Middle East comes from the constant threat posed by "Israeli" nuclear weapons.

'Abd-al-Rahim al-Kital emphasized the need to give countries that do not possess nuclear weapons the widest possible access to the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. He added that demonstrating cooperation and goodwill in resolving differences in this area is the proper way to bolster the NNT and to strengthen compliance with its provisions.

Al-Kital went on to say that bolstering the NNT and increasing the number of signatories cannot be achieved by media campaigns, but by the adoption of tangible and practical measures on the part of signatories to the NNT.

Al-Kital reaffirmed Iraq's efforts to support any measure to strengthen the NNT and to apply it on a universal basis that would reflect the commitment by all world states not to seek to acquire nuclear weapons.

The head of the Iraqi delegation recalled the pledge freely made by Iraq not to seek to acquire nuclear weapons when it signed the NNT in 1970. He added that Iraq reaffirmed this commitment on several occasions, most recently when His Excellency President Saddam Husayn said on 2 April that Iraq neither needs nuclear weapons nor seeks to acquire them.

The head of the Iraqi delegation referred to the agreement that Iraq signed with the IAEA in 1972—the agreement according to which a host of guarantees was given to the IAEA by all Iraqi nuclear installations.

Al-Kital added: Since then, the IAEA has actually been consistently conducting its relevant inspections in Iraq. He noted that the latest IAEA inspection was conducted during the period 7-12 April 1990. He said that this recent inspection included a visit to the site of the Tammuz reactor, which was the target of an Israeli air raid in 1981. He added that through 18 years of supervision and inspection, the IAEA has not documented a single Iraqi violation.

LIBYA

Further on Chemical Weapons Allegations

Sabha Facility Cited

LD0505184890 Hamburg DPA in German 1755 GMT
5 May 90

[Text] Hamburg (DPA)—Libyan revolutionary leader Mu'ammar al-Qadhafi intends, according to a report in DER SPIEGEL, to create the conditions for the production of chemical weapons in a different place, following the fire in the poison gas factory in al-Rabitah. This emerges from reports of Western secret services. The plans for the new project at the Sabha military base correspond "in essential details" to the plant in al-Rabitah.

According to a confidential report, which DER SPIEGEL says is in the hands of the Chancellor's Office, once again at least one West German firm is in on the project. The Thyssen Company is to supply hydraulic hoists, the report says, according to DER SPIEGEL.

Plans for the new poison gas plant are apparently already far advanced. The secret services report that in Sabha there is already a factory for the production of napalm, which is used in fire bombs.

'Official Source' Denies Report

LD0605150990 Tripoli JANA in Arabic
1420 GMT 6 May 90

[Text] Tripoli, 6 May (JANA)—An official source at the People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison and International Cooperation categorically denied news disseminated by mass media in West Germany regarding the existence of a new factory for the production of chemical weapons in the Great Jamahiriyyah. It said that there is no truth whatsoever in the existence of a new or an old factory.

The source stressed, in the course of its reply to a question from JANA, the previous firm Libyan Arab stand concerning this issue. It warned that such allegations could not be separated from the hostile campaign waged by circles hostile to the Arab nation and its technological and scientific progress.

The source recalled, in this context, the campaign that sisterly Iraq and other Arab countries, beside the Great Jamahiriyyah, are facing for no reason apart from the fact that these countries have decided to rely on themselves by producing the necessary things for the life of any person.

PAKISTAN

New Antitank, Antiaircraft Missile Developed

BK0705110190 Islamabad THE MUSLIM in English
7 May 90 p 1

[Text] Lahore, May 6—Engineers attached with the defence forces have successfully manufactured international standard anti-tank and anti-aircraft missile, which is expected to be launched soon for test.

The newly developed missile has been named as "green missile" and will have speed and destroying capacity equivalent to the American made anti-tank and anti-aircraft missile.

According to informed sources the new "green missile" will fulfil sufficient requirements of the defence forces to repulse the attack of tanks and warplanes on Pakistan territory in future.

The sources said that the missile was under study of experts of the defence forces and will be tested in near future.

It may be added that the defence forces were totally importing anti-tank and anti-aircraft missiles, from America and other Western countries, but after development of "green missile" the dependence on foreign countries will considerably come down.

SAUDI ARABIA

'Source' Denies Computer Use for Iraqi Missile

LD2704225690 Riyadh SPA in Arabic 2240 GMT
27 Apr 90

[Text] Riyadh, 27 April (SPA)—An authoritative source has denied what the ASSOCIATED PRESS reported, quoting an Israeli daily that "Iraq used the Saudi computer to carry out complex calculations needed for the development of the Iraqi missile program." The source added in his statement to SPA, which he made today, that "the report was categorically untrue; the computer in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is only used for civil purposes related to oil matters."

Defense Minister Cited on Arms Supplies

PM2604153290 London AL-HAWADITH in Arabic
27 Apr 90 pp 18-19

[Unattributed interview with Prince Sultan Bin-'Abd-al-'Aziz, second deputy prime minister, defense and aviation minister, and inspector general; place, date not given]

[Excerpts] [AL-HAWADITH] Are armaments orders expedited in President George Bush's era?

[Prince Sultan] Armament orders are not dependent on individuals or sources. They depend primarily on meeting the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia's requirements in order to fulfill its objectives of defending its holy places, security, and the Arab and Islamic nation's just causes. They are covered by comprehensive rules determined by Saudi capabilities within the framework of a unified strategic armaments plan. Through such rules the Kingdom's requirements and the types of weapons that comply with these rules can be determined. Then we are free to choose the sources according to the weapon's type and efficiency. On that basis, we have issued a number of orders, and now it is up to the U.S. Administration to respond to these requirements.

[AL-HAWADITH] Have you received all the Tornado aircraft from Britain? What have your visits to Europe achieved regarding armaments?

[Prince Sultan] Most of the Tornado aircraft have been delivered to the Kingdom under the agreement concluded between the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia's government and the British Government. The first consignment has been delivered in full. The second consignment is currently being delivered. As for our visits to the European states, they have achieved their objectives regarding armaments, as has been reported.

[AL-HAWADITH] Are there Egyptian and Pakistani forces in the Kingdom? Are there any Arab or foreign military bases there?

[Prince Sultan] That question has been raised by some sectors of the media, and I confirm here there are no

foreign forces in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. This is because the Kingdom's policy is to rely on Almighty God and the arms of its sons in defending itself and its holy places. But there are military training missions in the Kingdom's military bases, academies, and institutions, solely for training purposes.

[AL-HAWADITH] Israel accuses the Kingdom of possessing and manufacturing nuclear weapons. Do you have such a capability?

[Prince Sultan] The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has the capability to possess and manufacture nuclear weapons. But, as is known, the Kingdom is in the forefront of states urging that the Middle East be made a nuclear-free region, because it embraces holy places and mankind's heritage. It is also the meeting point of the continents. As is known, the Kingdom promptly signed the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, whereas Israel refuses to sign it.

[AL-HAWADITH] What has been achieved regarding Saudi armaments under King Fahd?

[Prince Sultan] The custodian of the two holy mosques is the commander in chief of the Armed Forces, which have received attention during his reign. More military cities, air and naval bases, and air defense centers have been established in various parts of the Kingdom. They are equipped with various facilities such as accommodation, hospitals, schools, educational establishments, and modern firing ranges. The custodian of the two holy mosques is anxious to monitor the Armed Forces' advancement, modernization, and efficiency himself.

[AL-HAWADITH] There has been talk about the Arab military industry within the framework of the Gulf Cooperation Council [GCC]. What about that industry?

[Prince Sultan] The GCC states now are proceeding toward the creation of a joint industry within the framework of our plans for self-reliance. There is also cooperation between the general establishment of military industry in the Kingdom and the industries to be developed in the GCC states.

[AL-HAWADITH] Has Germany delivered the tanks to you? What about submarines? Where have they been purchased?

[Prince Sultan] The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia's relations with the FRG are strong and based on the two countries' common interests. The trade balance between us is substantial. There are many German companies in the Kingdom. Regarding armament and the purchase of tanks, we have not broached this and nothing has been done regarding that. As for the submarines, the Kingdom is still studying the offers submitted, and we will choose whatever meets our defense requirements.

[AL-HAWADITH] Do you expect the Arab Industrialization Organization to be revived? Are there any disagreements over it?

[Prince Sultan] The Arab Organization ended and was dissolved more than 10 years ago. It is now at the stage of being liquidated in order to give all parties their rights. There are no significant disagreements. It is now at the stage of final liquidation.

[AL-HAWADITH] Has the Gulf war ended forever, or are the peace negotiations likely to suffer a setback?

[Prince Sultan] The end of the Gulf war depends on Iran and its desire to spread peace and security in the region. [passage omitted]

[AL-HAWADITH] How would you assess the GCC states' combat capability?

[Prince Sultan] The GCC states are eager to pursue a clear political outlook based on mutual respect for all states, adherence to international charters, and noninterference in others' affairs. Their combat capability has developed, with Almighty God's help, and they are now capable of repulsing and deterring any aggression against them. [passage omitted]

Ability to Obtain, Make Nuclear Arms Denied

*LD2804171690 Riyadh SPA in Arabic 1604 GMT
28 Apr 90*

[Text] Riyadh, 28 April (SPA)—A responsible source at the Ministry of Defense and Aviation has stated that what was published by the magazine AL-HAWADITH on 27 April 1990, quoting His Royal Highness Prince Sultan Bin-'Abd-al-'Aziz, second deputy prime minister, minister of defense and aviation, and inspector-general, to the effect that "the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is capable of obtaining and manufacturing nuclear weapons" was not said by his highness, and the latter knew of it only when it was published in the magazine.

In a statement to SPA, a responsible source at the Ministry of Defense and Aviation has affirmed "the commitment of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the agreement on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons which the kingdom has signed and entrusted to the ad hoc international organizations."

The source added: "At a time when it is eager to develop and modernize its defensive forces in order to protect its sanctities and defend its territorial integrity, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is in no way thinking of obtaining or manufacturing nuclear weapons, whose removal from the regions where they exist, the kingdom believes, is likely to realize the international peace we desire."

SYRIA

Soviet Envoy Holds News Conference on al-Asad USSR Visit

Affirms Commitment to Nation's Security

JN0105181690 Paris Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic
1800 GMT 1 May 90

[Text] In Damascus today, the Soviet ambassador held a news conference which lasted more than two hours during which he spoke about the results of President al-Asad's recent visit to the Soviet Union. The ambassador said that Moscow is committed to Syria's security and that it will continue to supply it with the arms it needs.

Israel, U.S. Faulted on Peace Efforts

JN0105210890 Paris Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic
2000 GMT 1 May 90

[Louis Faris dispatch from Damascus carried within the "Panorama" program]

[Text] Soviet Ambassador to Syria Aleksandr Zotov has announced that the Arab-Israeli struggle and the accumulation of arms in the Middle East will enjoy top priority during the next Soviet-U.S. summit. He described the situation in the region as dramatic and indicated that there is an immense accumulation of very destructive weapons, adding that something must be done in this regard.

Zotov was speaking at a news conference he held to talk about the al-Asad-Gorbachev summit which recently took place in Moscow. He described the summit as very successful and constructive. He said the Soviet Union held a very constructive dialogue with the United States, stressing the need to benefit from all the available possibilities and lay an acceptable foundation for a settlement in the region. He praised the Arab positions but held Israel responsible for impeding peace efforts. He also held the United States responsible for its failure to deal with Israel firmly enough. Zotov drew a contrast between the stands of the present and previous U.S. Administrations, explaining the TASS report that the two presidents, al-Asad and Gorbachev, are of the view that the stand of the current administration is worse than that of its predecessor. He said: The previous administration had definite factors. Without going into details, we are of the view that such factors are so far nonexistent in the present administration.

The Soviet ambassador emphasized the strength and depth of the Syrian-Soviet relations, emphasizing that to Moscow these relations are a model of Third World country relations. He described Syria as a sincere, strong, and effective ally.

Zotov announced that his country is committed to modernizing the Syrian Armed Forces' defense capabilities because Syria has legitimate defense requirements.

He said that the Soviet Union is responsive to these needs. He also emphasized Moscow's continuous commitment to Syria's security. He said that, during his meeting with Gorbachev, President al-Asad frankly affirmed that he was not trying to amass arms in Syria as an aim in itself, but, as a leader and Arab statesman, he feels a responsibility toward his people, toward Palestine, and toward the Arab world, and that he had to work so that justice might prevail in the Middle East.

In conclusion, Zotov said that Gorbachev understands this position perfectly, adding that Syria must have a strong defensive base so long as the principles of justice and the basic guarantees for all peoples in the region are not available.

Views Results of Moscow Meeting

JN0205104790 Damascus SANA in Arabic 0830 GMT
2 May 90

[Excerpts] Damascus, 2 May (SANA)—The Soviet ambassador in Damascus, Aleksandr Zotov, held a news conference at the Soviet Embassy last night and talked about the results of President Hafiz al-Asad's visit to the Soviet Union. A large number of newsmen, reporters, and correspondents of Arab and foreign news agencies and international television networks attended the news conference. [passage omitted]

Asked about supplying Syria with advanced Soviet weapons, he said that the Soviet Union is working to avoid confrontation in any part of the world, and that some sides view this Soviet position as placing pressure on Syria. He said the Soviet Union feels that there are certain Syrian defense requirements, that it also feels responsible for meeting these needs, and that President Hafiz al-Asad, as a leader, feels responsible toward his people and at the same time is working to bring about justice in the Middle East.

Regarding Israel's rejection of the international resolutions and its refusal to abide by the international charters, the ambassador said: Israel's overall position is so clear that President Gorbachev and President al-Asad did not spend much time defining that position or the nature of Israel's policy.

In reply to a question on current U.S. efforts, he said: The current efforts being made by the Washington administration are an alternative to the Soviet plans, which enjoy worldwide support represented in calls for convening an international peace conference on the Middle East. We were requested to study these proposals.

Asked if the issue of Syrian debts to the USSR were discussed, he said that the talks did not touch on this issue in particular, but centered on economic relations and ways of promoting them and solving related issues in the interest of both sides.

Regarding the modernization of Syria's defense sector and defining its main requirements, the ambassador

said: Contacts have begun. First, agreement should be reached on what we can provide. The talks also dealt with the main elements of the issue.

In reply to a question on how to reconcile Jewish immigration and U.S. settlement efforts, the ambassador said: I am not trying to lessen the gravity of this point. However, positive U.S. statements were made to the effect that Israel should abandon its dream of establishing greater Israel. Regarding Jerusalem, I can say that our Syrian friends highly appreciate these positive statements. But regrettably, as a result of pressures from the Congress and other forces, the U.S. Administration has retreated from its position on a just peace.

Asked if the Palestinian intifadah was discussed by President Gorbachev and President al-Asad during the Moscow summit, he said: During the talks, the Middle

East issue was discussed thoroughly, and the two presidents realize that the intifadah is one of the central events in the region. They also concluded that if Israel continues to block all paths to a peaceful and comprehensive settlement and if Washington does nothing, the Palestinian Arab intifadah will give up its peaceful nature. Talks also centered on the need to achieve more coordination among the Arabs, including the PLO. Gorbachev welcomed the tangible improvement in relations between Syria and the Arab countries.

Asked if the Lebanese problem was discussed during the summit talks, he said: The Lebanese problem was discussed, as well as support for the al-Ta'if agreement, the national accord, and the legitimate government in Lebanon. We also perceived an honest Syrian concern for Lebanon's interests in general.

**Lapygin on Arms Talks, U.S. Defense Programs,
Naval Superiority**

90WC0068A Moscow ZA RUBEZHOM in Russian
No 16, 13-19 Apr 90 pp 1, 5

[Article by Vladimir Lapygin, people's deputy of the USSR and chairman of the Supreme Soviet's Committee on Questions of Defense and State Security: "Not Increase but Decrease the Military Potential"]

[Text] The Soviet initiative on the 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive arms is gradually attaining a specific embodiment. As a result of the negotiations that took place during the time of E.A. Shevardnadze's visit to Washington, when both sides declared their striving to reduce arms, still another step has been taken in this direction, including in the area of conventional arms, the banning of chemical weapons and the strengthening of security and trust.

On the way to the achievement of the current agreements, we encountered initiatives of the U.S. administration aimed at obtaining unilateral advantages. They include proposals on the elimination of the Soviet heavy strategic missiles that the experts designate SS-18 and the reduction of missile systems through an increase in the number of strategic bombers with "air-to-ground" nuclear missiles. In so doing, the United States is striving to retain the right to develop SDI systems in the coming years without any limitations.

In the interests of guaranteeing peace, the Soviet Union made many concessions, demonstrating good will and trust. The reduction of the total number of nuclear warheads of ground, sea and air-launched missile systems objectively leads to a substantial reduction of the cost of SDI and makes its creation more realistic and, in my opinion, is a gift of many billions to the adherents of the development of this system.

The negotiations on specific questions in a treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive arms will be continued in Moscow in May and obviously the sides will consider the circumstance that one way or another the deployment of arms under the SDI program forces the Soviet Union to make an adequate response.

The trip of E.A. Shevardnadze to Washington was preceded by other important contacts at the national level that doubtless helped to improve the general situation. I have in mind the visit of U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker to Moscow and the exchange of delegations of U.S. congressmen from the Armed Forces Committee of the House of Representatives and members of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Committee on Defense Questions and State Security.

The visit by the Soviet parliamentarians took place in February 1990 with the background of the discussion of the military budget in the United States. On the one hand, as we were able to note, the administration is getting pressure from many members of Congress who

are concerned about the huge federal budget deficit. They are demanding savings through a reduction of military expenditures, especially since the notion of the enemy is disappearing—the USSR is even unilaterally reducing its armed forces. The general opinion is thereby this: the Warsaw Pact does not represent a threat under present conditions; its forces will never attack Western Europe. On the other hand, representatives of the military-industrial complex and conservatives in Congress are still operating with an enemy image and are demanding the preservation of power not against the Warsaw Pact but against the Soviet Union.

When our delegation visited the staff of the Strategic Air Command (SAC) of the U.S. Air Force (Offutt Air Base in Nebraska), the SAC commander Gen G. Chain gave a general overview of the function and composition of the forces and systems under his command. He accentuated the superiority of the USSR in mobile ICBM's. He thereby meant to stress the necessity of the deployment of two kinds of mobile ICBM's in the United States—the "MX" and the "Midgetmen," for which funds have been requested in the Pentagon budget for fiscal year 1991. Basically the report by the SAC staff was given in the spirit of the "cold war" with the main emphasis on Soviet military might and its continued proliferation.

Neither the SAC command nor L. Aspin, the attending chairman of the Armed Forces Committee of the House of Representatives, made any declarations that would correct the essence of the questions stated in the report. In summary, one can draw the conclusion that the report was sanctioned by the Pentagon leadership and pursued the objective of showing to the American public and Congress the necessity of approving the country's military expenditures requested in the budget for fiscal year 1991.

Thus, even in an atmosphere of growing trust, it would be incorrect to fail to consider the manifestation of conservatism in certain circles of the United States. Nevertheless, the administration made some concessions under the pressure of legislators and the public. Judging by the latest information, it is reducing its initial demands and it may be that the cuts in the military budget will amount to 3 or 4 percent (Secretary of Defense R. Cheney proposed a reduction of 2 percent). At the same time, the legislators fairly and justifiably pointed out that excessive expenditures for military needs and a proliferation of arms may lead to a new destabilization of the situation in the world.

In the discussion of the problem of the reduction of the military potential, much attention is being paid to defining the concept of sufficiency of the level of arms and armed forces that would guarantee their security without thereby endangering other countries. The complexity of the matter is that defense sufficiency is defined by the state itself on the basis of its own economic possibilities and obligations to its own people and to other states and also based on whom it is forced to oppose. It would seem that the most obvious criterion in

this matter is the share of gross national product expended for the maintenance and development of the armed forces. But this criterion knowingly puts countries in an unequal position, because they are not equally rich. It follows from what has been said that despite the obvious clarity of the aim of a reasonable sufficiency of armed forces the details of the search for a solution are confused and contradictory. For the first step, this leaves the "simple" solution of reducing the military budgets and armed forces of the two most powerful states on a reciprocal basis.

The situation is also delicate because the superpowers have, so to speak, their own interests relating to different regions of the globe. These interests came about historically as well as taking into account the events of the recent past. Thus, the maritime boundaries and commercial supply lines of the United States extended over many thousands of miles and their defense is considered to be in the national interest. But the American naval forces that are armed, among other things, with cruise missiles with nuclear warheads greatly exceed what is necessary for the performance of this mission.

As for surface ships, the navy of the USSR is considerably behind the U.S. Navy, which has an overwhelming advantageous not only over us but also over all the other navies of the world combined.

We are familiar with the point of view of the United States on this problem. As the American side stresses, the USSR has a powerful submarine fleet. This supposedly must serve as a convincing compensation for the advantage of the surface fleet of the United States. But the proposal jokingly made in the course of our conversations that we could "exchange fleets" did not find any support from the American side, even in jest. Their advantage is too great. This worries many countries, including our own.

At the present time, unfortunately, the naval strategy of the United States is offensive in nature and is called upon to guarantee the international order that is acceptable to Washington. We would like for the changes taking place in the world, in particular in the USSR, to influence the positions of the United States with respect to naval forces and contribute to the realization by the administration of G. Bush that the time has come for negotiations on the reduction of the navies.

The state of military aviation is far from "symmetry." The United States has the advantage in this area as well.

The B-2, the superexpensive "invisible" strategic bomber developed and manufactured in the United States in series is capable of penetrating thousands of kilometers into the territory of the USSR, of carrying on clandestine reconnaissance and of being prepared to deliver a nuclear strike. There are 57 operative "invisible" fighters. This requires a response from our side. The traditional response is that our research institutes and design bureaus as well as our industry must create the means to combat such weapons. But this had to be done at the expense of vital needs, social programs and definite sacrifices to the detriment of people and the environment. This, however, is the path that was taken in the period of the "cold war" and arms race. It did not do anything good for the world community. Precisely the arms race led to tension in the world and to its being on the brink of war. But a quarter century ago the arms potential was not yet capable of the total destruction of life on earth. Now it is. It must not be increased but decreased. For this reason, it is necessary above all to renounce developments of the latest weapons, including missiles, aircraft and warships, and research and development of systems under the program of the "strategic defense initiative." It is necessary to find ways for an overall reduction of the potential for mutual destruction and for verification so that this potential will not increase, including at the expense of other powers that are rather well developed and have more than 800 nuclear warheads in their armed forces. This is our point of view.

USSR President M.S. Gorbachev, the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Soviet Government want and are striving for peace and are working so that the ordinary individual can live better, more tranquilly and with more confidence. It is in this direction that unprecedented efforts are being made in the USSR. Our values are being reassessed. The individual and his needs take preference. But people need peace and trust between nations, which cannot develop without contacts between parliamentarians (among others). After our exchange of opinions with our American colleagues, we agreed that above all there must be a strengthening of the exchange of information between the committees of the Supreme Soviet and Congress that deal with defense matters. Joint hearings on the most current military and political problems and meetings at the level of experts and representatives of different branches of the armed forces will be useful. This is the way to work out specific agreements and proposals on the reduction of arms, military budgets and armed forces. We in the USSR Supreme Soviet intend to follow this path consistently.

EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

NATO's Woerner Calls for Readjusting Strategy

*LD0205125990 Hamburg DPA in German 1147 GMT
2 May 90*

[Text] Brussels (DPA)—In the coming weeks, NATO must reconsider its nuclear and conventional strategy and adjust it to the new conditions in Europe. NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner stated this on Saarland radio today. Then even Soviet state and party leader Mikhail Gorbachev will ultimately see that a united Germany within NATO is not a threat to the USSR, but an element of stability. Gorbachev would gain rather than lose by this.

On the subject of short-range nuclear missiles in Europe, Woerner said: "We cannot, of course, push for complete denuclearization, because this would rather increase the probability of conventional wars. During the coming ministerial conferences, however, we will certainly have to reconsider this nuclear scenario and make the necessary adjustments."

It is also "fully clear" that the "operational side" of the forward defense must be thoroughly reconsidered and changed if a greater Germany is to become a member of NATO, he said. The forward defense should not, however, be abandoned. Forward defense means defense as far forward as possible in the event of an attack. "It would be nonsense to relinquish this principle," Woerner said.

BELGIUM

Weapons Firm Investigated for Links With Iraq

*AU0505162390 Paris AFP in English 1427 GMT
5 May 90*

[Text] Brussels, May 5 (AFP)—Belgian magistrates have opened an enquiry into the weapons firm PRB, now British-owned, in connection with the firm's alleged covert links with the Iraqi arms industry, the daily LE SOIR reported Saturday. The paper said PRB which stands for Poudrieres Reunies de Belgique, had exported early in March last year, weapons officially destined for Jordan but "whose final recipient was not Jordan".

The PRB, now owned by Astra Holdings of Britain, was associated in the 1970s with American engineer Gerald Bull in a project to develop long-range artillery shells. Mr Bull, found murdered in Brussels on March 22, founded the Space Research Corporation, a firm suspected by the British government of having acted as intermediary to supply Iraq with parts for a giant gun.

Astra said last month that PRB, before it changed hands, had received an order in 1988 for projectiles of an "unusual" type, apparently destined to be used in a gun

of gigantic proportions. But Astra said it had received "absolute guarantees" that the munitions had never been delivered to Iraq.

PRB, which is in serious financial difficulties, applied Friday for a legal settlement to enable it to continue operating.

Defense Minister Welcomes Bush Arms Proposals

*LD0405174390 Brussels Domestic Service in French
1600 GMT 4 May 90*

[Text] The Atlantic Alliance's global strategy—which would mean abandoning land-based nuclear weapons—should be reviewed. This is the position which [Belgian Defense Minister] Guy Coeme will defend next week at the Nuclear Planning Group session in Canada—a position which was adopted today by the government. It is true that following the recent U.S. proposals of the same substance, this position has lost its controversial aspect. Listen now to the defense minister, interviewed by Pierre-Philippe Poitlet:

[Begin Coeme recording] It is true that the U.S. proposals are close to those the Belgian Government has always held. I have not said this just a month ago; I recall that two years ago, the Belgian Government was the first to take the path which is taken today by the entire Alliance. What the U.S. President has announced is a step which we should consider as extremely positive, in the direction of detente. We have always thought that it was not possible to modernize weapons which we could not use in the event of a conflict against territories and populations which are now friends; I mean the so-called East Germans, the Poles, the Czechs, and the Hungarians. In fact, concerning the future negotiations on nuclear weapons, the present U.S. position is similar to what the Belgian Government has always defended, that is, as soon as an agreement on conventional weapons is reached, negotiations on short-range nuclear weapons should start. [end recording]

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Stoltenberg Meets With U.S. Officials

Stresses Continued Need for NATO

*LD0205124190 Hamburg DPA in German 2254 GMT
1 May 90*

[Excerpt] Washington (DPA)—FRG Defense Minister Gerhard Stoltenberg has warned in Washington against the "serious strategic error of putting NATO up for disposal because of the increasing erosion of the Warsaw Pact and as a sort of countermove in exchange for the delusion of 'collective security.'" At an event held by the U.S. Institute for Contemporary German Studies on Tuesday, he said that NATO, as a political alliance, has a "leading role in opinion-forming and in shaping East-West relations". Without NATO "the Conference

for Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) would be lacking the necessary Western anchor".

The minister put forward the view that nuclear forces would in future serve less to deter a particular opponent than to "secure and stabilize a treaty-bound system for mutual security in Europe". For that reason the Federal Government decisively rejects a denuclearized Europe and continues to be interested "in balancing out the strategic impact of Soviet nuclear power on Europe, in preventing the political use of this power and in achieving stability with distinctly fewer systems". [passage omitted]

Assured on Defense by Cheney

*LD0105183790 Hamburg DPA in German 1749 GMT
1 May 90*

[Text] Washington (DPA)—The U.S. Government will consult the Federal Government before making any detailed decision on the withdrawal of U.S. troops from the Federal Republic of Germany. Federal Defense Minister Gerhard Stoltenberg received this assurance in Washington today in the course of a two-hour talk with his U.S. counterpart Richard Cheney.

Stoltenberg said that, as a result of the U.S.-Soviet agreement to station only 195,000 soldiers in Central Europe each, some 60,000 to 70,000 of the 250,000 U.S. soldiers will probably be withdrawn from the Federal Republic. Washington is, therefore, beginning to plan and consider the timing, regions, and garrisons for the cuts. Bonn is concerned about bringing in its own ideas, in agreement with the Federal Laender. While a withdrawal is desirable in some conurbations, there are "a very large number of towns and communities in the Federal Laender affected where it is desirable to keep the Americans." Cheney "promised that, before these decisions are taken, discussions can be held with us," Stoltenberg said. The defense minister, who also planned to hold talks today with Secretary of State James Baker and National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft, noted "consensus" with Cheney in evaluating East-West relations and the security policy situation. The success of the Vienna negotiations on the reduction of conventional forces is of crucial importance, Stoltenberg said. He hopes that the planned Soviet-U.S. summit at the end of May "will provide a positive incentive."

Defense Minister Rejects Nuclear-Free Status

*LD0205171590 Hamburg DPA in German 1431 GMT
2 May 90*

[Excerpts] Washington (DPA)—The Federal Republic of Germany cannot be a nuclear-free zone in the future, according to Bonn Defense Minister Gerhard Stoltenberg. Following talks with his U.S. counterpart Richard Cheney, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, and National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft, Stoltenberg said on Wednesday in Washington that the Federal

Government holds fast to the principle of military integration and is in favor of strengthening elements of the integration of units. "If that is the case, then it is unimaginable that we ... declare the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany to be a nuclear-free zone." [passage omitted]

Stoltenberg said there was agreement that a "component of nuclear weapons systems" is still needed. But he did not wish to discuss "individual issues" on Wednesday. [passage omitted]

Kohl Strongly Welcomes Bush Disarmament Plan

*LD0405124590 Hamburg DPA in German 1158 GMT
4 May 90*

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl (CDU) [Christian Democratic Union] has strongly welcomed President Bush's new disarmament initiative renouncing the modernization of short-range nuclear missiles in Europe. Like Bush, Kohl believes that a "key issue" for NATO is that it should strengthen its political role and review its strategy and the structure of its armed forces, said Government Spokesman Hans Klein in Bonn today.

Klein stated that Kohl and Bush agreed that following the conclusion of an agreement on conventional armed forces in Europe, negotiations should start on the existing land-based U.S. and Soviet nuclear short-range weapons.

In the view of the CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union] Caucus Chairman Alfred Dregger, it is important for Soviet nuclear tube artillery and short-range systems to disappear too. The present situation is characterized by a five-fold superiority of the Soviet Union in that sphere. In a statement, Dregger called on Soviet head of state Mikhail Gorbachev to disarm to NATO's low level in those weapons even before the negotiations.

Shevardnadze on 'Compromise' on NATO Membership

*LD0405124190 Hamburg DPA in German 1211 GMT
4 May 90*

[Excerpt] Bonn (DPA)—The Soviet leadership continues to reject NATO membership for a unified Germany, but does not wish to close its mind to a compromise. This was stated by Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze after his arrival for the ministerial conference on the future of Germany taking place on Saturday in Bonn. German membership in a military alliance would mean danger to European stability, Shevardnadze said on Friday in a First German Television interview. A united Germany should be free of alliances. But Shevardnadze stressed at the same time that a "compromise" must be sought on the matter.

Shevardnadze, who also met with Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl at noon on Friday in the chancellor's

office, expects that "no final decisions" will come out of the first meeting between the two German foreign ministers and the foreign ministers of the former allied powers of World War II. The governments taking part will present their respective positions. He will present again the Soviet views on the right of the Germans to self-determination and on the shaping of foreign policy. From the Soviet point of view, the process of unity should run synchronously with the shaping of the pan-European security structures. [passage omitted]

BUNTE: Al-Qadhdhafi Builds Poison Gas Plant

AU0405120490 *Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 1100 GMT 4 May 90*

[Text] According to the Munich illustrated weekly BUNTE, Libya's chief of state al-Qadhdhafi is building another poison gas factory. The weekly says that it is possible that German firms are involved once again. According to BUNTE, blueprints have allegedly been placed in the hands of the Federal Intelligence Service [BND] by a German source. The weekly says that in this connection, the Stuttgart public prosecutors are investigating two firms in the Baden-Wuerttemberg capital and in Ulm on suspicion of violation of the Law on Foreign Trade and Payments. The new poison gas factory reportedly is an underground plant in Sebha, 650 km south of Tripoli.

Firm Said To Aid New Libyan Chemical Plant

AU0705135390 *Hamburg DER SPIEGEL in German 7 May 90 pp 16-17*

[Text] After the supposedly feigned fire at the gas warfare plant in Al-Rabitah, Libya's revolutionary leader Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi wants to produce chemical weapons at another location, according to Western intelligence.

The plans for a secret project at the Sabha military base are "essentially" similar to the plant at Al-Rabitah, which was built with the help of the Imhausen Company of Germany. According to confidential information received by the Chancellor's Office in Bonn at the end of last month, at least one West German company is involved again.

"The Thyssen Company is to supply hydraulic lifts," a report alleges. Planning for the new chemical warfare plant seems to have reached a "very advanced stage," intelligence circles report. Initial orders for chemical raw materials and apparatuses "are believed to have already been placed." The list of chemicals to be imported include sodium fluoride and sodium sulfide—chemicals needed for the production of nerve gas—which were also used for the Imhausen project "Pharma 150" in Al-Rabitah.

The supply of the boilers in which the Libyans want to produce the poison gases and sarin is to be carried out via the companies "EDM Engineering" based in Lugano,

Switzerland, and "Technoglass ICM," based in Venice. The confidential report cites a person named U Thai Thiembunkit as the "main organizer" of the Sabha project. He also arranged the employment of workers in Al-Rabitah.

According to the intelligence report, a plant to produce napalm already exists in Sabha. The chemical agent, widely used by the United States in the Vietnam War for incendiary bombs, ignites upon impact and is difficult to extinguish.

In March, Al-Qadhdhafi had the Soviet surface-to-air missiles removed from the vicinity of Al-Rabitah. According to the intelligence report, the new poison gas plant is to be located in an underground bunker—"below an old fort"—to ensure protection against air raids.

FRANCE

Former Officials Urge NATO Reintegration

90ES0745D *Paris LE MONDE in French 18-19 Mar 90 p 18*

[Unattributed article: "Group of Experts Urges France To Rejoin NATO Planning Committee"]

[Text] In a report published Friday 16 March, Defense Renewal—a group of military affairs experts consisting mostly of retired diplomats and generals¹—urges France to rejoin the NATO planning committee in the military command structure of the Atlantic alliance from which it withdrew in 1966. The report also assesses the current threat, sets forth a strategy, evaluates the resources needed to implement it, and calls on France, in conjunction with West Germany, Great Britain, and the United States, to take the initiative on a European dialogue.

Though it does not believe the changes in Europe invalidate the rationale behind past defense options, Defense Renewal nevertheless considers that "France's defense effort is barely adequate" and suggests "adaptations" designed to improve our force posture.

The main proposal made by the experts group is the development, in cooperation with Great Britain, of a long-range air-to-surface weapons system (ASLP) capable of reaching the aggressor's territory and more likely to survive an attack than silo-based surface-to-surface missiles. The report also suggests the nuclear panoply could include the Hades missile armed with a warhead designed to generate "reduced collateral effects," i.e. a neutron bomb.

In conventional arms, highest priority should be given to increased force mobility and development of longer-range "intelligent" or precision-guidance weapons.

Defense Renewal considers that "the Atlantic alliance, that is the 'coupling' of European and American defense, and nuclear deterrence, have kept the peace for 40 years. These two pillars of our security must be preserved at all

costs. Any other course of action could lead to unpredictable hazards... Europeans must therefore play a larger role in their own defense," the group concludes.

Footnote

1. The membership of the group includes Jean-Marie Soutou, Jean-Marie Benoist, and Andre Monteil; Generals Guy Mery, Claude Grigaut, Jean Delaunay, Bertrand de Montaudouin, and Jean Thiry; and Admiral Paul Delahousse.

Rafale Substitution for Mirage-IV Viewed

90ES0745C Paris LE MONDE in French
21 Mar 90 p 15

[Unattributed article: "Rafale Could Replace Mirage-IV"]

[Text] The Air Force hopes that by the middle of the decade the Rafale can take the place of its Mirage-IV nuclear bomber for long distance strategic missions. There has already been speculation about this (LE MONDE of 16 March). But now the possibility has been confirmed in an article appearing in the latest issue of the monthly ARMEES D'AUIJOURD'HUI, an official Defense Ministry publication.

Over the years since 1964, France has deployed 62 Mirage-IV planes able to deliver a 70-kiloton nuclear bomb (about four times as powerful as the explosion over Hiroshima), in addition to land-based S3D missiles in silos in Haute-Provence and strategic missile-launching submarines renovated on the model of the "Inflexible."

In 1988 the airborne arsenal was modernized, with the installation—on 18 Mirage-IV's—of an ASMP (medium-range air-to-surface) missile capable of carrying a 300-kiloton nuclear device (about 15 times the energy of the Hiroshima bomb) over a distance of 100 to 300 kilometers, depending on firing altitude.

The Mirage-IV's, some of which have flown intelligence missions for operations in Africa, should in principle be retired from service in 1996.

In the latest issue of ARMEES D'AUIJOURD'HUI, Lieutenant Colonel Patrick Thouverez—currently in training at the Advanced Air War College after serving in the Strategic Air Force [FAS] to which the Mirage-IV's are attached—writes that the Rafale ACT (Tactical Combat Aircraft) is to be designated as successor to the nuclear bomber, if the ACT is armed with a new air-to-surface missile, the ASLP (long-range air-to-surface missile), which has greater range than the ASMP.

Missile With 1,000-Kilometer Range

Compared with the Mirage-IV, the Dassault group's Rafale has a 10 percent wider radius of operation, owing to the lower fuel consumption of its M88 engines, manufactured by SNECMA [National Company for the

Design and Building of Aircraft Engines]. It is engineered to be "stealthy," that it is less easily detected by enemy radars. It can take off from the shortest runways, and with more mounts under the wings and fuselage it can carry a greater mass and variety of armament.

Not least among the Rafale's weaponry would be the ASLP missile, technical specifications for which are currently being drawn up by the Aerospatiale group. Once launched from an aircraft, the ASLP would have a range of 1,000 to 2,000 km, the better to escape aerial detection by an enemy defense system.

According to Lt Col Thouverez, the capabilities of the Rafale-ASLP combination make it well suited to perform the deterrence missions currently carried out by the Mirage-ASMP coupling.

Appearing in ARMEES D'AUIJOURD'HUI under the by-line of a high-ranking officer, the article doubtless represents the Air Force General Staff's views on the future of what is traditionally called the FAS's "piloted component," as opposed to the "component" constituted by the missiles buried in silos on the Albion plateau. It also seems to fit with statements made by the Rafale program director at the General Delegation for Arms [DGA], engineer-in-chief Robert Finance, who revealed last week that the new combat aircraft could also carry the ASMP missile.

Air forces in the East as in the West want to preserve the "piloted component" of deterrence in addition to surface-to-surface missiles and strategic submarines, if only to avoid putting all their eggs in one basket. It remains to be seen whether such ideas are compatible with the Vienna negotiations, where these modern dual-capacity (conventional and nuclear) aircraft are viewed with some uneasiness.

'U.S. Departure From Europe' View Analyzed

90ES0745B Paris LE MONDE in French
24 Mar 90 p 2

[Article by Francois de Rose, ambassador of France: "Are the Americans Going To Pack Their Bags?"]

[Text] Among the growing number of theories about future security arrangements in Europe, one which finds favor with a number of experts and commentators is that the Americans are ready to "pack their bags." Some are even saying that "they have already left."

Without the gift of clairvoyance, it is difficult to assess the validity of that judgment. Generalizations and simplifications do not easily apply to such a large country where all manner of opinions abound on a subject of this importance.

Budgetary considerations doubtless argue for reductions in overseas forces. And it is no surprise that the average

[U.S.] citizen thinks Europeans and Japanese are populous and wealthy enough to provide for their own security. Against this background, the reduced threat level resulting from collapse of the Warsaw Pact cannot fail to encourage such thoughts.

But all that is only one side of the story. Statements by U.S. officials uniformly bespeak a determination to remain in Europe, even if force levels must decline significantly. And nothing in the appropriations bill (October 1990-September 1991) suggests a decision to go beyond announced reductions over the next few years. The U.S. position is probably based on considerations more substantial than the sentimental allure of the Old World: It is dictated by the fact that since the entire world political structure is built around Europe, the United States—as the only remaining superpower—ought to maintain a presence there, and by the fact that this presence responds to a certain concept of Atlantic community which has both idealistic and practical appeal.

But America's leaders tend to speak in vague generalities about the subject. Not because they would deliberately lie to us, but probably because [they believe] we Europeans, as older and more experienced peoples, would know better than they how to interpret events and the future.

In the face of these facts, some continue to talk about the necessity of preserving the Atlantic alliance. As if the alliance could survive a departure of the Americans, whose presence is the very cement that keeps everything from falling apart. In the tug of war between Mr Bush and Mr Gorbachev over a reunited Germany's membership in NATO, the American president is defending the interests of the European countries even more than those of his own. If he failed, we would be in for a period of total uncertainty about the security policy our neighbor would adopt: It could fall anywhere between two extremes, either of which would be fatal to the European Community—neutrality, synonymous with Germano-Soviet dominance in both military and economic domains; or establishment of the largest military force in Europe. A conventional force, naturally. But who can guarantee it would always be so?

The Germans, who are footing a large share of the bill for the American presence, seem for the moment less resigned than we to a dramatic change in the situation, since the chancellor has made the surprising offer to "finance the stationing of Soviet forces in the eastern part of the country."¹

Opposing Alliance

Others are wedded to the idea of a European defense, which they believe might be more viable if German and European unification went hand in hand. But the time for that is past. Which is not to say the idea is dead, merely that it does not address the question how such an essentially Franco-German structure could provide for the security of the continent's northern and Mediterranean flanks.

A third possibility would be an opposing alliance. No one talks openly about it, but who would dare to say the idea is not being entertained by some?

In the view of many, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe [CSCE] could be a panacea, a sort of United Nations restricted to the Europeans, Americans, Canadians, and Soviets. Notwithstanding the good works already accomplished by the institution, Soviet membership renders CSCE totally inadequate as a vehicle for dealing with security questions other than disarmament.

Finally, pushing distrust of the United States to utter extremes, Mr Chevenement sees our deterrent force as the instrument that would enable us to resist any "attempted blackmail by an abusive protector."²

But though our thoughts are in some disarray, let us not throw our hands up in despair. Far better to accept the fact that the alliance which has carried us safely through the dangerous period just ending now faces new problems: a revised strategy imposed by events in the USSR's former satellites, the future of nuclear weapons on the continent, the conditions under which American reinforcements would be accepted in crisis situations.

It is by adapting ourselves to the new conditions, not by putting an end to the concept of collective defense among the authentic democracies, that we will safely navigate the hazards of a transition period of indeterminate duration.

Footnotes

1. LE MONDE, 15 March 1990.
2. TF-1, 26 February 1990.

Eurodeputy Urges NATO Restructuring

90ES0745E Paris LIBERATION in French
24-25 Mar 90 p 8

[Interview with Alain Lamassoure, deputy in the European Parliament, by Jean Guisnel; place and date not given: "Alain Lamassoure: 'Reform of NATO is Inevitable'"—first two paragraphs are LIBERATION introduction]

[Text] According to the Giscardian deputy, France "must get involved in security issues." By combining a Euro-Atlantic alliance with European leadership, in order to make any German withdrawal "politically impossible"...

European deputy Alain Lamassoure examines France's new defense prospects and the upheaval in Eastern Europe.

[LIBERATION] While Eastern Europe is undergoing increasingly dramatic change, the political class in France seems little concerned about the implications of these changes for maintenance of European security. Do you agree?

[Lamassoure] The French have important things to say, and they say them: Jacques Delors in the European Commission, Valéry Giscard d'Estaing in the European Parliament. But the media are not very interested in what happens

beyond France's borders. One must also mention the scandalous irresponsibility of the French Parliament, in recess for three months now at a time when the House of Commons, the Bundestag, and the European Parliament are discussing these events on a daily basis.

[LIBERATION] If your group's proposal to hold a special session were adopted, what would you have to contribute to the debate?

[Lamassoure] I would sound an alarm: Our future is being decided without us. The calendar of major negotiations already underway or coming up soon is already fixed: the meeting of the "four plus two," German unity in March, the European Council in Dublin, Helsinki II, conventional disarmament in Vienna, the conference on monetary union. All these conferences point unequivocally to the fact that between now and the end of the year the foundations will be laid for a new European order. Yet neither France nor the European Community are real players in those talks.

[LIBERATION] That is not quite accurate. France is a participant in all of them...

[Lamassoure] As a spectator, yes; as an actor, no. The European Commission is generally informed after the fact, and at best consulted. It takes no initiative and is not involved in the real negotiations: Helmut Kohl goes alone to Moscow, then to Washington, and tells us about it afterward. To change this state of affairs, to make our weight felt, we must put France and thereby the European Community back in the game.

[LIBERATION] Isn't this exactly what Francois Mitterrand tried to do by proposing the idea of a European federation?

[Lamassoure] That idea is not on the agenda of any ongoing negotiations. It is also utopian and dangerous. A Europe stretching from Shannon to Vladivostok is as impossible as a Europe extending from the Atlantic to the Urals, for it fails to correspond to geopolitical reality: Even the Republic of Russia is four-fifths Asiatic. The attempt to create a federation of 35 states would serve only to retard unification of the Europe of the 12.

[LIBERATION] What do you propose as a way out of this impasse?

[Lamassoure] France must get involved. The key is the question of European security. The security environment has been completely transformed by the liberation of the peoples of Central Europe and the anticipated withdrawal of the Red Army. It is highly probable that the "four plus two" and CFE [Conventional Forces in Europe] negotiations will result in very sizeable reductions of Soviet and American military presence in Europe. That will very quickly pose the question of the future of NATO and unified Germany's continued membership in it. Now it would be a very serious setback if NATO were to wither, or if Germany pulled out. At the same time, a restructuring of NATO is inevitable and

also in Europe's best interests: once their troops are gone, the Americans will no longer be able to claim a dominant role.

[LIBERATION] How, specifically, should France "get involved"?

[Lamassoure] By simultaneously proposing transformation of the Atlantic alliance into a Euro-Atlantic alliance and offering to participate as a military partner. France would be integrated into a new military structure, under European leadership and with reduced American participation; the military commander of the new alliance would be French, British or German, on a rotating basis. France could thus make it politically impossible for Germany to withdraw from collective security arrangements, whereas today voices are being raised proposing that Germany be accorded "French status," i.e. presence in the alliance but absence from the military organization. Realistically, France and Germany must be the core of any new organization.

[LIBERATION] Wouldn't France lose its independence at the same time?

[Lamassoure] No, because it will hold onto its strategic nuclear weapons, which could never be used except by order of a democratically designated political authority. Until European political unity becomes a reality, France and Great Britain will continue to make their own independent decisions on the matter.

[LIBERATION] And what do you do about tactical nuclear weapons? Must France unilaterally abandon the Hades missile?

[Lamassoure] With regard to tactical and prestrategic arms, it is obvious that the receding line of contact [between hostile forces] changes the nature of our needs. The alliance will need nuclear weapons able to reach from Western Europe into the territory of the aggressor, not Poland or Czechoslovakia. This need is better met by the ASMP [medium-range air-to-surface missile] than the Hades. France should offer to deploy the appropriate weapons systems on allied territory and make them available for the common defense, using a two-key launch authorization protocol. And the next generation of such weapons should be designed and developed jointly with the British.

Composite Materials in 'Tiger' Helicopter

90ES0745G Paris *LE QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS*
in French 28 Mar 90 p 20

[Article by Henri Tricot: "This 'Tiger' Is Composite"]

[Text] Aerospatiale has unveiled the core fuselage segment of the future Franco-German "Tiger" helicopter. A unique feature: Composite materials are present in a big way.

A segment of brown fuselage in an Aerospatiale hangar at Matignane: not all that spectacular in appearance. But important enough for Aerospatiale President Henri Martre and the head of the state-owned company's helicopter division to make the trip to see its unveiling.

Because its completion represented an important step, as a tangible sign that this Franco-German project begun back in mid-1987 is moving toward fruition.

With disarmament now at hand, it might seem an odd time to introduce a new model of war machine that comes in several different versions. But executives at Aerospatiale have a ready response: Since disarmament will mean a reduction in materiel, high-performance equipment becomes even more important, so that "cuts," when they are made, will come out of the oldest items in inventory.

From that standpoint, the "Tiger" is expected to meet the needs, for it embodies a number of assembly-line "firsts." One notes, for example, the massive use of composite materials, with the just-unveiled fuselage section featuring fiber carbon and other exotic substances. Most of the helicopter will basically be made of "aramide graphite." One will also find thin "aramide layers" in some of the doors and on the upper part of the helicopter (the engine cowling, for example). By adding a bit of titanium, plexiglass, glass and several laminar layers of aluminum, one obtains a fuselage that weighs less and is more resistant than one made of traditional materials. All at once that small "segment" of helicopter unveiled at Matignane assumes a much more compelling aspect: It is the first element of the first helicopter embodying completely new technology.

And the cutting-edge technology is not limited to materials. The "Tiger," for example, will be the first anti-tank vehicle fitted with a targeting sight mounted above the rotor. Advantage: It remains undetected until the moment its anti-tank missiles are fired.

Perhaps the most important features are invisible: Packed with electronics, the "Tiger" will have avionics equipment—currently being designed—as advanced as the most modern fighter aircraft. And of course it is also equipped for operation at night.

It may not be a match for the "Firefox" of science-fiction cinema fame, but the gunner will have a helmet-mounted sight/display, with the help of which he will never have to take his eyes off the target.

Aerospatiale, Italian Firm Sign Agreement

AU0705112290 Paris AFP in English 1044 GMT
7 May 90

[Text] Paris, May 7 (AFP)—French group Aerospatiale said Monday it had signed a long-term cooperation agreement for missile weapon systems with Selenia of Italy.

The two had agreed "to carry out research and development, conceive industrial projects, and carry out commercial promotion together in Europe and the rest of the world," Aerospatiale said in a statement.

The agreement covers existing systems and new projects of both companies.

Aerospatiale and Selenia are already cooperating on ground-to-air systems within Eurosam under an agreement signed between the French and Italian governments in late 1988.

The two groups have also signed an agreement aimed at launching cooperation in the satellite sector, but details have yet to be worked out.

GREECE

Recriminations on Mirage Aircraft Purchase

Reported Uselessness

90ES0712A Athens I KATHIMERINI in Greek
18 Mar 90 p 4

[Unattributed article: "The Mirage 2000: A Very Deceptive Vision... Air Force Considers These Military Aircraft Useless"]

[Text] Greece is not taking possession of the remaining 12 Mirage military aircraft remaining from the "French portion" of the "purchase of the century" because these aircraft have serious problems and flaws that make them useless operationally.

This was the conclusion reached by the Supreme Air Force Council—albeit very late in the day, a fact for which the responsible Air Force authorities undoubtedly are to blame. The council found that:

1. There are serious problems with the Mirage 2000's radar, which affects the aircraft's operational capability.
2. The Mirage aircraft that we have taken possession of also present other serious problems, including "vibration during braking," "deformation of wing flaps," and "erroneous hydraulic pressure readings."

These facts prove that the choice of two types of aircraft—a decision opposed even by N. Kouris, former chief of the National Defense General Staff and a very close associate of A. Papandreou's—was a disastrous one. Not only because it cost this country more foreign exchange but also because while the Air Force suffers the consequences of the double choice, it has added an essentially useless "weapon" to its arsenal. In other words, the decision to choose two types of aircraft for reasons of "political advisability" has hurt the country in many ways.

More specifically, according to very reliable data available to I KATHIMERINI:

1. Problems with the Mirage radar were discovered when we took possession of the first aircraft in Bordeaux. These problems primarily involved the fact that the radar was affected by... weather conditions, which of course makes that instrument useless. It should be noted that Greek authorities did not consider the explanations provided by Thomson, the manufacturer, satisfactory.

Furthermore, the company refused to admit that the radar did not meet its specifications. At the same time, it tried to win time and not correct the technical problems in the aircraft's electronic instruments.

The following is a significant—and striking—point in the whole affair: It turned out not only that it is impossible to solve all the problems with the radar but also that we will not know the results of the modifications we have asked for until after we have taken possession of all the aircraft!

2. Thomson has admitted that the effectiveness of the aircraft's electronic instruments is reduced by weather conditions, depending on the density of rain, fog, clouds, and snow!!! Furthermore, the radar's inability to function makes it harder to locate the real target, as was proven by test flights when we took possession of the aircraft.

3. Air Force authorities are coming to the conclusion that the manufacturer's delaying tactics make it doubtful whether it will be possible to solve the problems even after taking possession of the aircraft. The result will be to wipe out the Mirage's entire general operational capability.

4. The problems discovered so far mainly affect the air-to-air mission for which the Mirage has been used up to now. This has created grave suspicions in the Air Force that similar problems will turn up with the air-to-ground mission as well. These suspicions are well-founded because other countries have found similar problems with the aircraft's operation when using them for such missions.

The issue of the Mirage in the "purchase of the century" is a very grave one and of course this increases the responsibility which both the then prime minister and the then Air Force leadership bear for the harm done to the Air Force's operational readiness.

Balance of Forces Affected

90ES0712B Athens 1 KATHIMERINI in Greek
1 Apr 90 p 7

[Article by former Air Force Chief of Staff Periklis Oikonomou: "Balance of Forces and Purchase of the Century; Effective Measures Urgently Needed"]

[Text] In recent years PASOK [Panhellenic Socialist Movement] has boasted about the Armed Forces modernization programs and particularly about the "purchase of the century", which has caused such an uproar because of the tremendous sums squandered "in the name of the Greek people." However, let us put aside this extremely unpleasant aspect of the matter and examine what benefit it has brought this country's defense and more specifically how it has affected the balance of forces between the Air Forces of Greece and Turkey.

Greece purchased 80 modern aircraft, 40 F-16's and 40 Mirage 2000's, whose inferior radar gives them, to put it as kindly as possible, just one eye, a fact which not even PASOK officials can deny.

The decision to purchase two types of aircraft, as even the then chief of the Air Force General Staff noted in his report, deprived us of the capability to support them at the factory level. In other words, maintenance and particularly repairs can be carried out in this country only up to a certain level, beyond which we must rely on foreigners.

Turkey, on the other hand, purchased twice as many aircraft as we did, 160 compared to 80, and all of a single type (F-16's), which enable it not only to provide full support but also to assemble/manufacture 150 of them in country. This also provided Turkey with technological knowledge that will be not only valuable in the manufacture of other types of aircraft but also exceptionally useful for the modernization of the country in general—a benefit which Greece was deprived of with the purchase of two types.

In addition to this, Turkey is equipping these aircraft with one of the most modern self-defense systems (electronic and other equipment); it is produced by an American firm that is highly respected in the field (Loran). Given the weapons currently available to destroy (shoot down) aircraft from the ground (antiaircraft systems) and from the air (hostile aircraft), it is virtually impossible for aircraft lacking such systems to survive.

Nothing of the sort has been announced as yet for our own 80 aircraft, even though the need for them was recognized long before the aircraft were ordered—specifically, in the specification and negotiation phase. Due to the government's meddling, the conflicting interests of the various party groups, and the general disorganization that prevailed in PASOK's eight years, our aircraft lack this valuable protective armor.

There is something else that is extremely important. Turkey is equipping some of its aircraft with the Low Altitude Navigation and Targeting, Infrared System for Night (Lantirn). This makes them capable of flying at very low heights—to avoid detection by radar—at night or in poor weather, attacking their targets with ease, and returning to their bases untouched. In other words, with the Turks' installing these systems, we essentially risk suffering very grave damage without even realizing we are being attacked.

The very high technology Lantirn systems are manufactured by the internally respected American firm Martin Marietta and on 9 February the U.S. administration requested permission from Congress—because of the high security classification—to sell them, declaring them necessary for the modernization of the Turkish Armed Forces (permission probably has already been granted). As for our own aircraft, unfortunately nothing of the sort is visible on the horizon today.

Thus we have, on the one hand, 80 partially equipped aircraft and, on the other hand [as opposed to], 160 fully equipped aircraft with the finest technical support. Consequently, from the viewpoint of material resources we can no longer talk about a balance of forces in the air over the Aegean. It has already been overturned and we urgently need to take effective measures to restore it. Of course the balance of forces is determined not only by material resources but also by the human element, on which we have always relied. But in the PASOK years, with the mismanagement, the government by incompetence, and the firings and retirements of dissidents, did that human element enjoy the moral backing to fight hard to stay up to date and acquire its not risk-free training? Undoubtedly not.

Or, if the hour ever comes, will we have to ask our pilots to give their lives for their country, having armed them only with the warrior's spear but not with the requisite shield? If the answer is yes, then we will be very foolish because we will be looking for heroes rather than victors and in so doing we may win glory but we will certainly lose the war.

U.S. Aircraft to Turkey

90ES0712C Athens I KATHIMERINI in Greek
1 Apr 90 p 7

[Article by Kostas Iordhanidhis: "Modern Aircraft to Turkey; United States Probably To Donate Them, Not Fortuitously"]

[Text] As it inevitably was dragged into the election campaign, the issue of the correlation of forces in the air over the Aegean has taken on far greater dimensions than this country's political leadership imagined.

On Wednesday an ATHENS PRESS AGENCY cable from New York quoted "State Department and Pentagon circles" as saying that instead of destroying its very modern aircraft as part of the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, the United States might donate them to Turkey.

The statements from the aforementioned "circles" to the ATHENS PRESS AGENCY came just a few days after the issue of the Greek Air Force's purchase of 40 each American F-16's and French Mirage 2000's returned to the fore.

According to informed sources in Athens, the idea of "redistributing" the alliance's defense materiel from central to southern Europe in the event of a CFE treaty is very old but the specific mention of aircraft on the one hand and of Turkey on the other hand is probably not fortuitous.

Domestically, the issue of the "purchase of the century" has taken a novel turn, to put it mildly, since there is no precedent for the more or less open confrontation between the leadership of a branch of the Armed Forces and a political leader like the one that has arisen with the

22 March letter from the Chief of the Air Force General Staff responding to the charges from the president of New Democracy, K. Mitsotakis, about the "purchase of the century."

In the view of informed sources in Athens, these developments demand a more substantive approach to the issues affecting the Armed Forces and a more careful study of the real facts in the purchase of the new fighters.

It should be noted that the order for 40 F-16's has already been filled. The U.S.-manufactured combat aircraft have been incorporated into the Tactical Air Force and constitute a significant deterrent force, given that as of today Turkey has taken possession of 47 F-16's, regardless of the size of the total order.

At the same time, it should be noted that the training of Greek pilots has been completed and that a flight simulator has been installed to permit new pilots to be trained for the U.S. manufactured F-16.

The offsets issue also demands serious study because a mechanical search for correspondences often leads to incorrect conclusions. Informed sources stress that the completeness and correctness of a contract is one thing and that implementing it is another.

Very reliable sources in Ankara note that Turkey has protested over the indirect offsets General Dynamics offered Greece, despite the fact that the Air Force General Staff's order totalled just 40 aircraft. Ankara asked that its own package be adjusted to the Greek level.

The fact that the Investment Company has been inactive for years is tied up with Greece's inability to take advantage of the opportunities offered by the indirect offsets agreement, due to the inertia of the Greek Government bureaucracy.

As for the direct offsets, their purpose has always been to obtain high technology rather than direct returns and their implementation depends on the necessary investments being made.

Because there has been no investment for some years, the expected direct offsets with the U.S. firms General Electric and Westinghouse have not come about, informed sources in Athens report.

At the same time, the lack of investment threatens EAV's [Greek Aircraft Industry] offsets program with General Dynamics for the construction of 485 air ducts and 253 rear fuselage sections, as EAV pointed out dramatically in last week's statement.

The fashion in which the "purchase of the century" has been brought into the election campaign has shown that the issue of Armed Forces purchasing programs is tied up with the parameters of our country's international relations, with unpredictable reactions in the Armed Forces, and finally with the Greek economy's ability to take advantage of any offsets agreements.

Mitsotakis is absolutely right to be concerned about the possible overturn of the correlation of forces in the Aegean due to the PASOK governments' erroneous judgements, and whatever government emerges from next week's elections will have to restore a satisfactory correlation of forces in the air.

It would be foolish, informed sources note, if having realized our country's weakness in the Aegean, the next government implemented certain programs around which there was a "strange mobility" a few months ago and which presuppose Greek air superiority over Turkey.

PORTUGAL

Interest in Locally Produced Laser Weapon

90ES0612A Lisbon DIARIO DE NOTICIAS
in Portuguese 25 Feb 90 p 3

[Text] Portugal could eventually be supplying foreign armed forces with simulated fire systems that use laser technology and are produced in Portugal, LUSA was told by Assistant Secretary of State for Defense Eugenio Ramos.

A demonstration held to show the potentialities of the systems—in their applications for the army and the air force or for both in conjunction—was successful and left the concerned officials enthusiastic as to the possibilities opened up for training of the Armed Forces and for Portuguese industry.

In the presence of the secretary of state for defense; high-ranking officers of the three branches of the Armed Forces; and officials and researchers of the National Industrial Engineering and Technology Laboratory (LNETI), which is developing these systems, Army units, and Air Force aircraft last Friday carried out tests at the Alcochete firing range.

The Army once again tested the "Sitpul" system of firing instruction using laser technology (a system it has been using for some time), while the Air Force tested for the first time an air-to-ground fire system for approach training that is based on the same technology and will permit a computerized reading of the results of the exercise.

Ground and air forces also carried out a joint exercise during which an Air Force fighter aircraft "zeroed in on" an "enemy" infantry unit and it was possible to determine the number of soldiers "hit."

The simulated fire system based on laser technology uses the emission of beams aimed at targets that incorporate receiving equipment capable of determining the number of "shots" and with what degree of precision they hit the targets.

Secretary of State Eugenio Ramos disclosed that the systems developed by the LNETI in collaboration with

the Armed Forces and Portuguese industry can be regarded as comparable to, and the equal of, various systems already existing in other countries and offer a number of advantages.

"They permit savings in terms of the assets and equipment customarily used for training (aircraft, artillery pieces, or tanks) as well as ammunition, and also reduce the ecological damage," Ramos said.

TURKEY

Need for Increased Arms Spending Explained

90ES0730A Istanbul DUNYA in Turkish
19 Mar 90 p 2

["From Inside the Events" column by Tevfik Gungor: "Can Turkey Cut Its Military Spending?"]

[Text] The United States and the USSR have reached an agreement to cut their armaments. That is wonderful. Now we too can reduce our arms spending. At least that is what I thought. But it turns out that, unfortunately, we cannot do that. Because, it turns out, our problem was not "Russia," but others. NATO's most senior commanders and Turkish military and civilian officials in NATO state openly:

"The battle strength of the Turkish Army is very low compared to NATO standards. What is important is not the quantity of arms and men, but the training of the soldiers and the effectiveness of the weaponry. Turkey is weak in both of these areas.

"Most importantly, the military forces of Turkey's neighbors, namely Greece, Iraq, and Syria, are now superior to those of Turkey."

Defense Against Neighbors

We talked to NATO's supreme commander, General Galvin, and his deputy, General V. Eide, in Brussels. What the commanders said is very simple:

"In the event that Turkey gets into trouble with one of its neighbors and an armed conflict ensues, that would be Turkey's own responsibility; NATO cannot go to war because of Turkey."

"It is up to Turkey to decide whether its relations with its neighbors mandate the deployment of a 'deterrent' military force which 'can provide for a feasible defense' when necessary."

Apparently, NATO is not concerned that Syria receives massive military aid from the USSR or that the stockpile of Russian arms on Syrian territory is growing.

Apparently, NATO does feel uneasy about the fact that Iraq has a very powerful and well-trained army equipped with very advanced and effective weapons bought with financial aid obtained from oil-rich Arab countries under the pretext of the "war with Iran."

Apparently, NATO believes that the arms superiority Greece has acquired over Turkey, and Greek moves to escalate bilateral disputes as a result of this superiority, are problems that concern the two countries alone.

Our Sacrifices for NATO

Our position is: "Turkey is NATO's indispensable border sentry. Turkey has made great sacrifices for NATO. The West must pay for these sacrifices in one way or another."

The NATO commanders are very explicit: "Turkey has not incurred any additional military expenses or undertaken any additional obligations because of NATO. Although Turkey did take on some responsibilities within the framework of NATO programs, it did that voluntarily because it thought these commitments helped its own defense. NATO did not impose any additional obligations on Turkey. On the contrary, it contributed to some extent to the training and outfitting of the Turkish Army."

Strong Economy, Training

In the final analysis, everything depends on a strong economy. We must first strengthen our economy so that we can allocate more money for the Army.

The need to maintain a "deterrent counterforce" in view of the characteristics of our neighbors leaves no room to cut military spending; on the contrary, it mandates increases.

But decisions are needed on certain issues in order to benefit from the money allocated for military spending:

"The Turkish Army cannot base its manpower on the people's capacity to have children. A system in which every 18-year-old male is conscripted into military service and each conscript is fed and paid 2.5 million Turkish lira a year for one and a half years is outmoded."

We must put aside slogans like "make your own weapon" or "fly your own plane" and channel limited resources to the purchase of the most effective modern weapons.

The strength of modern armies comes not from "legendary faith and heroism" but from "training." Those who can utilize modern arms technologies most effectively and intelligently will gain the upper hand.

Conclusion

At a time when all European countries are moving toward disarmament and cuts in military expenditures, Turkey must unfortunately do the opposite.

If Turkey does not take serious steps toward "modernizing and strengthening its army" soon and does not comprehend the importance of this issue, very grave "calamities" may fall upon the nation.

Assessment By a Turkish Officer

Retired Admiral Yilmaz Usluer states: "Turkey's defense budget for 1990 is 7.841 trillion Turkish lira. Of that amount, 303.2 billion Turkish lira has been set aside for defense investments. This figure constitutes four percent of the defense budget. The remaining 7.5 trillion Turkish lira (96 percent) of the defense budget is appropriated for personnel, consumption expenditures, and machinery and equipment maintenance and repairs. This budget essentially covers only personnel expenditures and maintenance and repair operations."

UNITED KINGDOM

'Stiffening' of Soviet Arms Stance Seen

LD0505084790 London PRESS ASSOCIATION
in English 0808 GMT 5 May 90

[Report by Chris Moncrieff, PRESS ASSOCIATION
chief political correspondent]

[Text] Defence Secretary Tom King said today there was an "indisputable stiffening" of the Soviet attitude towards arms control. Mr King spoke out over Kremlin opposition to the idea of a unified Germany belonging to NATO. He expressed his views as the so-called Two-Plus-Four talks between representatives of East and West Germany and the four wartime allied powers—Britain, France, the United States and the Soviet Union—get under way in Bonn.

Mr King said: "I think there have been signs in recent weeks that the Soviet Union is taking a tougher line on arms control. I am going to Moscow in a week's time and I'm going to be very interested to see what the attitudes are. There are reports that the armed forces are exerting greater influence and are not happy about some of the developments that have taken place. I shall be anxious to see for myself what evidence there is of this. There has been an indisputable stiffening in recent weeks. Quite clearly the Soviet Union is going through a very difficult time, a time of real tension and strain and quite clearly the armed forces are worried about some of the implications of that."

Mr King on BBC Radio 4's Today programme, said Mr Gorbachev, the Soviet president, was showing courage in facing the challenges. "But no one should underestimate the scale of his difficulties," he added.